DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 155 VT 013 088

AUTHOR	Trotter, Joseph A., Jr., Ed.
TITLE	Project Crossroads. Final Report
INSTITUTION	National Committee for Children and Youth, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	91p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Correctional Rehabilitation; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Demonstration Projects; *Job Placement; *Manpower Development; Out of School Youth; Prisoners; *Probationary Period; Recidivism
IDENTIFIERS	District of Columbia; *Project Crossroads

ABSTRACT

In this pilot program, pretrial manpower services were provided for first offenders in juvenile and adult courts in the District of Columbia. The project offered intensive services to selected youthful arrestees during a 90-day continuance of their trials. At the end of this period charges could be dropped on the recommendation of the project staff. The demonstration phase began in 1968 and ended in February 1971, at which time the project became an independent component of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. A related document is available as ED 048 445. (BH)

VT013088

ED055155

Project Crossroads

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

PROJECT CROSSROADS STAFF

Leon G. Leiberg, Project Director

Joseph A. Trotter, Jr., Assistant Director

James H. Davis, Supervisor, Court Services

Frederick L. Hill, Senior Job Development Officer

Daniel S. Little, Manpower Specialist

Norman C. Baptist, Senior Community Worker

Suzanne I. Simmons, Community Worker

Roosevelt McIlwain, Community Worker

Randall B. Moore, Community Worker

Leonard H. Logan, Community Worker

Glenn R. Graham, Job Development Officer

B. Shelton Givens, Job Development Officer

Alfred E. Warren, Community Worker

Montrose M. Johnson, Secretary

Sylvia P. Jeter, Secretary

CONSULTANTS

Roberta Pieczenik, Sociologist:
"Program Evaluation"

John F. Holahan, Economist:
"Cost-Benefit Analysis"

VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA (VISTA)

John Gabel
John Krell
Eugene McCabe
Antonio Modica
Paul Nurick
James R. Steel
Sally Waldron

EDITOR: Joseph A. Trotter, Jr.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED055155

A FINAL REPORT TO THE

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION, U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

PROJECT CROSSROADS

A Demonstration Investigation of the Reaction of First Offenders, Male and Female, Ages 16 to 25, Provided Intensive Pre-Trial Manpower Services as an Alternative to Delinquency Adjudication or Criminal Prosecution in the Juvenile Court and Court of General Sessions of the District of Columbia.

Leon G. Leiberg
Project Director

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Washington, D. C.

1971

This report on a special manpower project was prepared under Contract Number 82-34-68-15 with the Manpower Administration, U. S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Organizations undertaking such projects under Federal Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor. The contractor is solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all material developed in this report.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
NATIONAL COMMITTEE for Children + Youth
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright National Committee for Children and Youth, 1971.
Reproduction in whole or in part permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
FOREWORD		v
INTRODUCTION		vi
I.	SUMMARY AND FACT SHEET	1
II.	OBJECTIVES	7
III.	RECRUITMENT AND ENROLLMENT	11
	A. Overview	11
	B. Court of General Sessions	11
	C. Juvenile Court	12
IV.	EMPLOYMENT SERVICES	15
	A. The Local Manpower Situation	15
	1. Needs	15
	2. Area response	16
	B. Project Employment Services	19
	1. Placement procedures	19
	2. Employer contacts	20
	3. Employment assistance to non-enrollees	21
	C. Employment Characteristics of Participants While Enrolled	22
V.	COUNSELING	24
VI.	EDUCATION SERVICES	28
	A. VISTA Utilization	28
	B. The Program	28
	C. Procedures	28
	D. Problems	30
VII.	DIVERSION AND RECIDIVISM	33
	A. Diversion	33
	B. Recidivism	34
VIII.	SUMMARY OF ANALYTICAL REPORTS	36
	A. Measurement of Program Impact	36
	B. Benefit-Cost Analysis	41
IX.	TRANSITION	47
APPENDIX		49
A.	Expanded General Sessions Court Criteria	50
B.	Expanded Juvenile Court Criteria	51
C.	Correspondence Regarding Project's Transition to D.C. Superior Court	54
D.	Letter of Intent Between Project and NYC	66
E.	Research Design	68
F.	Congressional Record Reprints	76

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The National Committee for Children and Youth and the staff of Project Crossroads thank the following persons and organizations who have helped in making the program a reality:

- The staff of the Office of Research and Development, Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, in particular:
  Mr. Seymour Brandwein, Director
  Mr. William Throckmorton, Project Officer

- The staff of the D.C. Court of General Sessions, in particular:
  The Honorable Harold H. Greene, Chief Judge
  The Honorable James A. Belson, Associate Judge
  Mr. Dallas Grasty, Coordinator, Criminal Justice Assignment Division
  Mr. Gene Johnson, Law Clerk

- The staff of the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia, in particular:
  Mr. Thomas Flannery, United States Attorney
  Mr. Luke C. Moore, Chief, Criminal Division
  Mr. Charles Work, Assistant U.S. Attorney
  Mr. Frederick Watts, Assistant U.S. Attorney
  Mr. John Jungans, Chief Clerk
  Mr. David Sullivan, Deputy Chief Clerk

- The staff of the District of Columbia Bail Agency

- The staff of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia

- The District of Columbia Manpower Administration, in particular:
  Mr. Maurice L. Hill, Director, Office of Employer and Technical Services
  Mr. Lorenzo M. White, Chief, Division of Job Opportunities
  Mr. Jack Smith, WMA Job Bank
  Mr. Frankie L. Carson, WMA Job Bank

- The staff of the United States Civil Service Commission

- The staff of the United Planning Organization and affiliated WCEP Centers.

- Mrs. Mary Gormley, D.C. Board of Education

- The Washington Post and Washington Star Newspapers

- Radio Stations: WWDC, WMAL, WAVA, and WAMU-FM

- Mr. Joel Abramson, Counsel for Senator McC. Mathias (Maryland)

- Mrs. Patricia Wald, Attorney

- Mr. Thomas M. Rosser, Business Manager, The Brookings Institute

- The Metropolitan Board of Trade, in particular:
  Mr. Edward Parlati

- Mr. Jack Lemay, Drug Fair Corporation, Washington Office

- Mr. Hanson Buchner and Associates

Finally, our thanks to the many individuals and agencies not listed who, through their active support and encouragement, contributed substantially to the fulfillment of the goals of Project Crossroads.

FOREWORD

Crime has become one of the most virulent diseases of our society--a disease for which no certain prevention or cure has been found. The President of the United States, in his 1969 State of the Union Message, called for " . . . war against the criminal elements which increasingly threaten our cities, our homes and our lives." The President asked for "new and stronger weapons" to wage this war. Perhaps, in this report of Project Crossroads, we may identify a few "weapons" which we believe can be effective in the continuing search for answers to this growing problem.

Project Crossroads, the National Committee for Children and Youth's pilot pre-trial intervention program for youthful offenders, began January 15, 1968, and became part of the services to youth of the court system of the District of Columbia on February 1, 1971. During the three years we have worked with young people in their first conflict with the law we have learned many things about them. Given an opportunity for a job that pays a decent salary and provided adequate training to qualify for one that holds hope for advancement, the majority will choose work rather than crime. Youth have little patience, however, and even the best job may become boring, so it is essential that supportive services be available. There is no simple solution, of course, for each youth presents a different problem and a new challenge.

If these young people can be turned aside from lawbreaking before they have established a "record," there is greater hope that they will refrain from committing further acts of delinquency and crime. One of the most crippling handicaps a young person can have in seeking a career is a record of conflict with the law. If redirection and new motivation can be achieved before the habit of lawbreaking has been established, prevention, the most powerful weapon against crime, is in our hands.

Whatever gains or successes have been achieved are due, to a large degree, to the tireless devotion of Leon Leiberg and his capable staff. Mr. Leiberg's creative approach to the needs of young people in trouble has produced an innovative program of delinquency and crime prevention and social justice.

The National Committee for Children and Youth is honored that the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor has seen the merit in our proposals for programs to assist young people in the urban setting and we are grateful for the financial support which made Project Crossroads possible. We wish the Courts of the District of Columbia success as they carry forward the program that has been Project Crossroads. We are pleased that many of the staff of the project will be working in this new court program and we particularly congratulate the Court on securing the services of James H. Davis to direct it. NCCY will continue to endeavor to develop new approaches to the many problems facing young people in our complex society.

Isabella J. Jones
Executive Director
National Committee for Children and Youth

INTRODUCTION

This final report on Project Crossroads attempts to present the implications, problems, and achievements of an experimental and demonstration project involved in pre-trial intervention with first offenders in Washington, D.C.

While the documents describe, review, and analyze what has taken place during the project's existence, much by necessity is left unsaid. The development and the implementation of this contract by NCCY for the Office of Research and Development, U.S. Department of Labor, was a most challenging and difficult effort, the total flavor of which cannot possibly be recaptured in writing. Nevertheless, we have attempted to produce a document which should stimulate and assist others wishing to improve the quality of justice by introducing the concept of intensive manpower services in the pre-trial period as a meaningful tool for offender rehabilitation.

We also hope that the reader will recognize this limited effort in action research as germane to the problems faced by our communities, particularly as they relate to the administration of justice, and as offering alternatives to crime in an age of confrontation.

The support and assistance received from the judicial and prosecutorial authorities of the District of Columbia was a constant reminder to all of us that the confidence placed in the project's aims had to be earned by the highest level of performance every individual on the staff was capable of giving. The recognition given the project by incorporating its essential elements into the ongoing operations of the court at the conclusion of the demonstration period is proof that the individuals who administer the system are not wholly bound by tradition, but deeply interested in the quality of justice in rapidly changing times.

The non-traditional workers who have staffed the project deserve special recognition because they were able to recognize and to live by the rules and objectives of an experimental effort which was not created primarily to serve the poor nor to organize them.

The project was intended to explore a particular method, to analyze experiences in developing that method, and to determine whether the method is valid and viable, and can be developed at a reasonable cost. We believe we have proven the method is a good one and hope that the success of our effort will help to produce policy changes in an area fraught with controversy and misunderstanding.

We are grateful to all individuals and agencies who have helped us in making Crossroads a reality.

Leon G. Leiberg
Project Director

January, 1971

I. SUMMARY AND FACT SHEET

Project Crossroads was initiated in January 1968 as an investigation of the feasibility and effectiveness of offering young first offenders a program of intensive manpower services in the pre-trial period as an alternative to delinquency adjudication or criminal prosecution and possible subsequent incarceration through the courts of the District of Columbia. The concept of pre-trial intervention embraced by the project had three points of focus: the criminal defendant himself, the criminal justice system which must respond to his social deviance, and the community to which both belong.

In the first instance, the project aspired to provide accused offenders with an assist along the road to social and economic viability through the application of intensive manpower services. In the second area, the project undertook to demonstrate a feasible method of increasing the flexibility of the criminal justice system and rendering it more effective as a rehabilitative vehicle. The former was achieved by building into the system an alternative to the three traditional dispositional possibilities: discharge without supportive services, release on probation (formal or informal) with a modicum of support, or incarceration, usually the least desirable of all. At the same time, the system's effectiveness of rehabilitative and deterrent mechanism was enhanced by the availability of relevant, personalized, and intensive services for young offenders who may be on the threshold of a criminal career, and for whom normal court processing would not, in all probability, be a helpful or rehabilitating experience. Thirdly, if this intervention strategy was successful, it was anticipated--and demonstrated--that the community as a whole would gain from a reduction in recidivism among the group served, as well as from their improved employability and productivity.

Project Crossroads was designed for implementation over a three-year period, the first year of which was devoted to exploration and development in the areas of program concepts, staffing, administration, human services, and the utilization of community and VISTA volunteers.* The second phase concentrated on testing program effectiveness by measuring the impact of services on the 825 participants. At the time of this writing the project is slated to become an independent component of the new Superior Court of the District of Columbia in February 1971.

HOW THE PROJECT OPERATES

Organization and Staffing

The project staff of 14 paid workers and seven VISTA volunteers is divided into three components: counseling, employment services, and education. The counseling section of five community worker-counselors and one supervisor is responsible for both the screening of prospective enrollees andthe provision of close guidance and supportive services for assigned caseloads which average about 20-25 youths per counselor.

The employment section of three placement officers and a manpower specialist has a task of evaluating the employment and training needs of enrolees and placing them in positions offering skill upgrading, good pay and upward mobility.

The education section of the project is staffed by seven VISTA volunteers assigned by OEO to provide community involvement in the Crossroads program. The VISTAs recruit and coordinate a volunteer staff of about 45 tutors to provide individualized tutoring and test preparation services to project participants and other youths referred by community agencies.

*For a complete report on first year operations, see Project Crossroads Final Report - Phase I, National Committee for Children and Youth, 1969.

Backing up the three operational components are a project director, an assistant director, and two secretaries.

One of the project's experimental and demonstration features has been the utilization of non-professional staff in what have been traditionally professional occupational roles. Consequently the project is staffed primarily by non-professional workers, most of whom are culturally and experientially similar to the participant population. These workers have demonstrated their ability and dedication to the goals of the project and have earned the respect and praise of their professional counterparts in other community agencies.

Recruiting Participants

Project Crossroads recruits participants from both the Juvenile and General Sessions (adult) Courts of the District of Columbia. In the adult jurisdiction, project recruitment procedures closely parallel normal court processing of defendants. Project community workers screen all defendants detained in the court cellblock prior to each day's arraignment, and interview those who meet enrollment criteria. If an eligible defendant desires to participate in the program, the consent of the United States Attorney's Office and of assigned defense counsel is then obtained and an identifying card attached to the defendant's court papers. When the defendant's case is called, usually within 2-3 hours of his initial interview, his case is continued for 90 days to permit project participation and the youth goes directly from the courtroom to the project office only one block away.

Recruitment procedures are different for the project's Juvenile Court program. There court Intake Officers, who interview each youth referred to the court on a delinquency complaint and decide whether or not he is to be petitioned for a court hearing, refer cases meeting Crossroads criteria to a project community worker stationed in the court. If the youth desires to enroll after the program has been explained to him, the intake officer is notified and the youth is invited to the project office, preferably with a parent or guardian, to be formally enrolled and assigned a counselor-community worker. The cases of juvenile participants are also calendared, whenever possible, to permit a 90-day project enrollment period.

Following are the project's enrollment criteria as of September, 1970:

1. SEX, AGE: Males and females between 16 and 26.

2. RESIDENCE: Washington, D.C., Metropolitan Area.

3. EMPLOYMENT STATUS: Unemployed, underemployed, or job in jeopardy because of arrest; for juveniles, tenuous school enrollment or school dropout.

4. PRESENT CHARGE:* Petit larceny, auto theft (attempted), receiving stolen property, false pretenses, forgery, soliciting for prostitution, attempted burglary II, simple assault (relative), unlawful entry, presence in illegal establishment, destroying property, procuring. Irrespective of charge, drug addicts, alcoholics, and defendants with serious psychological disorders are excluded.

*Offense criteria were expanded in December 1970, to include burglary, possession of amphetamines and barbiturates, and robbery (pocketbook snatch where there is no injury to the victim). The criteria were also expanded to include defendants through 40 years of age.

5. PRE-TRIAL RELEASE STATUS: Must qualify for personal recognizance under the criteria of the District of Columbia Bail Agency.

6. PRIOR RECORD: For adults, no previous adult conviction nor incarceration for more than one year as a juvenile; for juvenile participants, no adjudication of involvement within preceding 12 months, no pending case less than six months old, no previous incarceration for six months or more.

Counseling and Personal Assistance

Each new Project Crossroads participant is assigned a community worker-counselor who is responsible for providing supportive services for the duration of his project program and for submitting biweekly evaluation reports on his project performance to the appropriate court.

The initial contact between counselor and participant is usually the "intake interview" conducted on the latter's first visit to the project office after recruitment. During this interview the program is explained in detail and the counselor ascertains the youth's immediate needs--usually employment and, in many cases, emergency financial assistance--and any personal or family problems that may require referral to local social welfare agencies.

During the first couple of weeks when a participant's project program is being developed, his counselor maintains frequent or even daily contact with the youth. When the participant is settled into a job and/or school situation, the counselor is expected to maintain personal contact with him at least once weekly and telephone contact as frequently as possible. Home visits are the primary focus of personal contacts, since any rehabilitative efforts must take into account the factors of a youth's home environment which may be somewhat responsible for his social problems. Visits to a participant's job as well as school and neighborhood contacts are also emphasized.

Although group counseling is not an integral part of the project's supportive services, counselors are encouraged to hold group sessions with members of their caseloads whom they feel will benefit from group discussion of mutual problems.

An important facet of Project Crossroads is its role as a middleman between participants and local social welfare service organizations. While many participants and their families have needs far beyond the budgetary and staff capabilities of the project, they often lack knowledge of the availability of appropriate resources or of the necessary procedures to obtain access to them. These needs range from medical and dental care to legal assistance, to emergency food, shelter and clothing. Liaison has been established with public and private organizations able to address these various needs and arrangements made for expedited access to services for participants and their families.

Employment and Training Placement

After his initial interview, each participant is accompanied by his counselor to the project's employment section where a job placement officer discusses the various employment and vocational training opportunities available to him through the project. The employment staff arranges employment interviews for the youth in the occupational area of interest to him, and will continue to do so until a suitable placement is made. If the participant desires and is qualified for a job not then available, the staff attempts to develop an appropriate opening.

Application forms for government jobs and most of the local manpower training programs are kept in the employment section and all necessary arrangements for testing or interviewing for such positions can be made directly from the project office. There is

a close working relationship with the Manpower Training and Employment Security Administration (MTESA) of the District of Columbia, with sharing of information and mutual support.

The employment staff and counselors periodically review the status of each participant to determine if a change in employment is necessary or advisable, either because of job dissatisfaction, lack of upward mobility, or the availability of new jobs for which the participant is better suited.

Education Services

Each new participant is given an orientation on the project's remedial education program by one of the VISTA volunteers responsible for that component. Individual tutoring is available four evenings per week in the project office and specialized programs such as preparation for the high school equivalency diploma examination, remedial reading, job test preparation, and preparation for armed forces qualifying examinations are offered. The participant is encouraged to avail himself of the education program to any extent he desires and which is compatible with his job or school schedule. The education staff also provides assistance to youths who wish to re-enroll in school and those who are seeking admission to colleges. A scholarship fund donated by friends of the project has been established at two local colleges for qualified project participants.

Ancillary activities conducted by the education component include field trips, films, seminars with guest speakers, and intra-project sports competitions.

Court Review

Biweekly progress reports on each enrollee are forwarded to the appropriate court for inclusion in the youth's case file, with copies to defense counsel and/or parents.

At the end of the prescribed 90-day period, a participant's counselor may make one of three recommendations to the court at a disposition conference: (1) dismissal of pending charges based on satisfactory project participation and demonstrated self-improvement; (2) extension of the continuance to allow the project staff more time to work with the individual; or (3) reversion of the defendant to normal court processing, without prejudice, because of unsatisfactory performance in the program. In addition, at any time during the 90-day period a participant may be unfavorably terminated and revert to normal court processing and trial either because of chronic uncooperativeness or the commission of a new offense.

RESULTS

From the start of court recruitment in April 1968, through September 1970, a total of 825 young offenders had been enrolled in the project, 74 of whom were still active. Charges against 467 enrollees had been dropped due to their successful project participation, while 283 were returned to normal court processing, primarily because of unsatisfactory program performance. The respective dismissal rates for program participants were 76% for General Sessions Court (adult) enrollees and 40% for Juvenile Court enrollees.

In keeping with the manpower orientation of the project, approximately 1000 job and training placements have been made for participants, including non-enrollees, and over 6000 hours of remedial education and test coaching was provided by volunteer tutors under the direction of the project's VISTA component.

Independent research studies* of the project's adult component indicated that the intensive supportive services provided by project staff during the three-month enrollment period has a substantial stabilizing effect on participants in the post-project period. For example, the employment rate among former adult enrollees a year after leaving the project was double their employment rate at enrollment, and this despite the fact that almost none were in their Crossroads-obtained jobs a year later. The increased job stability among former enrollees, despite job changing in the post-project period, is reflected in the finding that more than half were employed 80% or more of the 12 months following Crossroads termination, while only 30% of the group had been employed for that large a percentage of the year preceding their enrollment.

The quality of their labor market participation was also substantially enhanced. Less than 8% of the enrollees had earned a wage higher than $2.25 per hour during the year prior to their enrollment, including less than 2% who earned more than $2.75. The respective percentages for the total group during the year after leaving the project were 28% and 12%. In addition, the percentage of employed enrollees in skilled and clerical-office positions doubled from 7% to 15%.

Increased stability and job improvement in the labor force participation of former enrollees were accompanied by much lower recidivism rates among the Crossroads group compared to a similar group of adult first-offenders who did not receive project services. When the 15-month recidivism rates of both groups are compared, the overall recidivism rate of favorably terminated Crossroads participants is <u>less than half</u> that of the control group as a whole (22.2% versus 45.7%), as well as that of those controls who had their charges dismissed in the course of normal court processing (44%). Furthermore, the recidivism rate for <u>all</u> former participants--favorable and unfavorable--is still a <u>third</u> lower than that of the control group as a whole (31.4% versus 45.7%).

Equally as encouraging as the favorable employment and recidivism data from the point of view of program replication, the project resulted in a benefit-cost ratio of 2:1, and a program cost of little over $500 per enrollee.

More important than the apparent statistical "success" of the project, however, are those accomplishments and findings which have far-reaching implications for the criminal justice system itself: (a) the successful utilization of non-professional staff, including ex-offenders, in professional caliber roles within the criminal justice system; (b) the coordination of community-based rehabilitation services for defendants in the pre-trail period with the requirements of judicial due process; (c) the development of a feasible alternative to adjudication and probable sentencing to probation with its consequences of a criminal record; and (d) last but not least important, the demonstration that private sector involvement in the mission of a social institution can be constructive and mutually beneficial when undertaken in the spirit of cooperation and dedication to a common goal.

These are the accomplishments which we hope will stimulate broader experimentation with the pre-trial intervention concept so that when techniques, methodology and orientation are refined, and the evaluations completed, court systems throughout the nation will adopt the concept as a valuable tool in achieving the criminal justice system's goal of rehabilitating the social deviant.

*Summaries of these are included in the present report. The complete studies have been printed separately by NCCY and may be obtained upon request. The research design is presented in Appendix E.

PROJECT CROSSROADS FACT SHEET

January 15, 1968-September 30, 1970

OPERATING AGENCY: The National Committee for Children and Youth

FUNDING AGENCY: Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor
Office of Research and Development - Division of
Experimental Operations Research

STARTING DATE: January 15, 1968 (Court Operations: April 22, 1968)

COMPLETION DATE: May 15, 1969 (Phase I)-September 15, 1970 (Phase II)

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: A demonstration investigation of the reaction of 750 first offenders, male and female, ages 16 to 25, provided intensive pre-trial manpower services as an alternative to delinquency adjudication or criminal prosecution in either the Juvenile Court or the General Sessions Court of the District of Columbia.

AREA OF OPERATION: District of Columbia Metropolitan Area

STATISTICAL DATA:

Total Participants		1421
- Enrollees	(825)	
General Sessions Court	[528]	
Juvenile Court	[297]	
- Unofficial (non-enrolled) participants	(596)	
Legal Status of Inactive Enrollees at Termination		751
Adults		
- Charges dismissed upon project recommendation	(356)	
- Reverted to court for unsatisfactory participation	(109)	
- Others (deceased)	(1)	
Juveniles		
- Charges dropped at enrollment	(72)	
- Charges dismissed upon project recommendation	(39)	
- Other adjudication	(59)	
- Recommended for dismissal	[30]	
- Still awaiting judicial action at termination	(115)	
- Recommended for dismissal	[43]	
Active Enrolles as of October 1, 1970		74
- Employed full-time	(43)	
- Full-time school	(7)	
- Unavailable for employment	(12)	
- Unemployed	(12 or 16%)	
Total Employment and Training Placements by Project		983
- Enrollees	(517)	
- Unofficial participants	(466)	
Total Placements of Enrollees by Project		517
- Jobs	(299)	
- Training or pre-vocational positions	(218)	
Total Participants in VISTA Education Program		306
Hours of Remedial Education Provided		6295
Total Number of Participants Rearrested While Enrolled		78 (10%)
Program Cost per Enrollee		$506.52

******

II. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Perhaps because stoicism is not a common quality among persons attracted to the social sciences field (particularly those engaged in operational projects) experimental and demonstration (E & D) projects have a built-in psychological fail-safe. This is the underlying assumption that a program has reached its objectives--in E & D terms--if it is innovative, develops a feasible approach to the problems at which it is directed, and documents both its innovative techniques and practicability so that others may learn from the experience. Accordingly, an E & D program differs from a pure research project in which flexibility in innovation and procedure is restricted, and from a straight action project in that its impact on the problem to which it is directed is of a policy nature.

Project Crossroads was conceived as an E & D project, its primary objective being to explore the feasibility of intensive pre-trial manpower services as an intervention strategy in a court-based program; secondarily, the project was to measure its impact on recidivism and labor force status of the participant group, as well as conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the program. It was decided to undertake latter tasks subsequent to an initial period of exploration and innovation with program design, staffing, operational approaches, and the establishment of program linkages with the police-court-corrections system and other community agencies.

This approach entailed many difficulties, not the least of which was the problem that the research and cost analysis would, of necessity, be based on data from the earliest stage of the program to permit longitudinal evaluation. Thus, final measurements arrived at would reflect program effectiveness and cost-benefit ratios during a period in which the project's design and services were still being "experimented" with, in order words, before the program established a standard operating procedure, and would be very conservative. More important from the researcher's standpoint, a research design had to be imposed ex post facto and upon a staff oriented toward operations rather than research. Despite these and other problems, however, the pressing need for hard data on not only the feasibility but the effectiveness of the manpower-oriented pre-trial intervention programs justified the less than ideal conditions and program mix. Moreover, the measurement techniques developed to evaluate the impact and cost effectiveness of the project, and the problems encountered, would be useful in developing a uniform evaluation system for all types of offender programs.

Because the findings and implications of the project's research objectives are presented in detail in Chapter VIII, the present chapter discusses only those findings and recommendations generic to the project's experimental and demonstration objectives;

1. "To demonstrate that a coordinated system of pre-trial manpower services can be developed effectively with the police-court-corrections system to offer selected youthful offenders, arrested but not yet tried, an alternative to delinquency adjudication or criminal prosecution."

- Finding

  That intervention is feasible and acceptable to the authorities administrating the system. The principal attraction of this strategy to prosecutors in particular is that it permits them to retain control over a defendant's case during the participation period.

- Recommendation

  In order to obtain the approval of the authorities, it is important that negotiations take place before a pre-trial intervention program reaches the operational stage to clearly define responsibilities, obligations, and procedures to be followed by those administering the project. Such agreements should ideally be incorporated in a formal document and be subject to periodic review and amendments. It is not realistic to expect immediate implementation of a theoretical program design by a

project staff. As in any endeavor, a planning phase is necessary to examine the practical difficulties likely to be encountered in program implementation and to anticipate the capability of responses to such contingencies.

2. "To utilize non-traditional staff, including former offenders and service volunteers, in an integrated manner, with promotion based on accomplishment and merit, not on credentials."

- Finding

Such personnel have been found to be very effective but it is a fallacy to assume that any indigenous, non-credentialed worker can perform at a high level of proficiency without training or supervision because of his "innate empathy" with the client group.

In-depth screening and orientation to the aims of the program before the non-professional is given work assignments must be required. A continuing in-service training program, focused on work requirements, is imperative.

- Recommendation

Ideally, the staff needs to be selected and receive a period of training before the project reaches the operational stage. New staff cannot be simply assigned and be expected to achieve efficiency by osmosis. A training program must be developed and administered during "project life" by trained staff to impart knowledge in the broad areas of human services. Individuals unwilling to learn or incapable of working in a team setting should not be retained.

3. "To test different approaches to the various problems which affect program efficiency in the area of human services and the delivery of manpower services to offenders."

- Finding

The inherent freedom of experimentation in a demonstration program has to be interpreted to agency personnel closely associated with the project. Since an extensive documentation is required reporting on changing procedures in program development, the wide dissemination of periodic project reports is useful. Thus, it is possible to share findings and receive feedback without impeding basic programatic experimentation.

- Recommendation

Periodic written summaries covering every facet of program development is a must. Input, however, has to be required from all sections of the project in order to obtain an in-house capability and to foster analytic thought. A report should not simply be a document to a funding agency, contractually required, but must become an instrument of communication and training within the program itself.

4. "To perfect techniques for measuring the extent to which such services aid the individual to become and remain gainfully employed and deterred from future criminal activity, and the social costs and benefits, in economic terms, of providing these services."

- Finding

Unless program personnel are given the opportunity to assess impact, services rendered a client group are largely

meaningless in view of the enormous needs. Placement and counseling efforts must reflect the aims of the effort and be subject to frequent review to avoid stratification and artificial restrictions in the delivery of services. A program must acquire an in-house assessment capability to compare the proficiency of effort with the results obtained.

• Recommendation

The utilization of consultants with specific capabilities is urged in order to strengthen program aims and to complement staff efforts. Consultants must, however, be prepared to interpret their views to the operational staff and be sensitive to the issues reviewed.

5. "To assess the impact of project services on its participants, the criminal justice system, and the community at large."

• Finding

Asking the recipients of services for comments on how they view program efforts is necessary and provides for a good evaluative contribution.

At the same time the objective assessment on the part of the court-police system through review of official records of the actions and behavior of program participants provides for impact measurements independent of emotional considerations.

• Recommendation

The client group, participants, and the court-police system must be involved in viewing program aims in terms acceptable to them. Such an involvement provides for many benefits, not the least of which is an objective presentation to the public at large by persons other than project staff.

6. "To effect a transition of the Crossroads program, if successful, from an experimental pilot project to a permanent pre-trial intervention program for offenders in the District of Columbia Court system."

• Finding

The receptivity of court administrators to view the project in long-range as well as short-range terms was reflected in the relationship established from the onset of the program.

The willingness to consider new intervention strategies to reduce criminality made possible the institutionalization of manpower services in a court setting.

• Recommendation

To obtain results derived from E & D experience in the judicial context, legal requirements and methods have to be understood and respected. Only if the collaborative effort is methodical, avoids duplication, and results in a better delivery system can it be expected to become permanent, provided that it improves the administration of justice.

7. "To provide technical assistance in program development to agencies and organizations interested in initiating manpower programs for offenders, and develop a replication model of the Crossroads program."

• Finding

The importance of sharing with interested parties the experience obtained is mutually beneficial and crucial in avoiding costly and unnecessary mistakes. While geographical and political realities ultimately determine the flavor of a program, much of the experience gathered can be utilized irrespective of locale simply because of the advantage in time and the earlier conceptualization.

• Recommendation

The creation of a replication model serves as a testing ground and provides a point of departure for improved methods and a more efficient utilization of funds. It provides also a concrete example of possible intervention and a foundation upon which others can build.

III. RECRUITMENT AND ENROLLMENT

A. Overview

New enrollments averaged about 30 per month throughout the project, but the rate of new juvenile enrollments during Phase II was less than half that of Phase I, despite expansion of recruitment criteria for the Juvenile Court program. New adult enrollments during Phase II, however, increased by more than 40% a month, with no changes in the recruitment criteria. The steep decline in juvenile caseloads in conjunction with steadily increasing adult enrollment necessitated dissolution of the project's separate counseling components for Juvenile Court and Court of General Sessions enrollees (each with a supervisor and two or three counselors). The project's entire counseling staff was eventually consolidated under one supervisor, with one of the five counselors handling juvenile cases only.

The 825 total cumulative enrollment in both phases of the project as of September 30, 1970, consisted of 297 juveniles and 528 young adults--and the contractual obligation to service 750 participants was satisfied earlier than anticipated while maintaining agreed upon selection criteria.

B. Court of General Sessions

Recruitment in the Court of General Sessions of adult defendants between 18 and 26 years of age improved both in volume and efficiency during Phase II. Three hundred forty-five new adult participants were recruited through September 1970 of the second phase, an average of 23 per month. This average was approximately 40% greater than the monthly enrollment rate during Phase I, about double the percentage increase in General Sessions court defendants between fiscal years 1969 and 1970.* The following chart shows total project enrollment during Phases I and II by court recruitment source, and the increase in average monthly recruitment from each source during Phase II.

RECRUITMENT SOURCE	ENROLLMENT		% CHANGE IN AVERAGE MONTHLY RECRUITMENT
	PHASE I (9/1/68-5/15/69)	PHASE II (5/16/69-9/30/70)	
Lockup	70	174	+28%
U. S. Attorney	19	64	+74%
Defense Counsel	36	99	+42%
Citation Cases	14	34	+22%
Judge	4	9	+32%
Other	---	5	--
TOTALS	143	385	+39%

As indicated above, most of the increase in recruitment was attributable to U.S. Attorney and defense counsel referrals. Most participants recruited from these sources were defendants whose original charge fell outside the scope of project offense criteria and thus could not be recruited by project personnel directly from the court lock-up. By breaking the disqualifying charges down to acceptable misdemeanors (e.g., Burglary II to petit larceny and destruction of property), the prosecutor's office provided access to rehavilitative services for first offenders who appeared good risks but were arbitrarily

*Report of Chief Judge Harold H. Greene to Attorney General John M. Mitchell on General Sessions Court operations during FY 1970.

excluded from the project and at the same time permitted the project staff to test its effectiveness with a broader range of offenders.

The project's maintenance of a high success rate with defendants charged with more serious offenses prompted the U.S. Attorney's Office to ask for an official request from the project director to expand the Crossroads offense category criteria to include many of the offenses which previously disqualified a participant for enrollment unless "broken down." This request was submitted in July 1970 to Mr. Luke Moore, Chief of the General Sessions Court Division of the United States Attorney's Office, and approved in December 1970. The expanded criteria are presented in Appendix A.

C. Juvenile Court

The most pronounced change in project recruitment and enrollment during the second phase was the substantial reduction in the rate of juvenile enrollment compared to Phase I. During the latter period, an average of 16 juveniles per month were enrolled in the program, while during Phase II this rate declined to six per month. As was noted previously, the situation was reversed in the case of adult defendants recruited in the Court of General Sessions: the monthly enrollment rate for this group increased from 16 to 23 per month during Phase II.

The decline in juvenile enrollment was the result of several factors. Most significant was the increased emphasis during the second half of the project on enrolling only those juveniles who were first offenders. During the earlier phase of the program the project was accepting every juvenile referred by the Intake Division of the Juvenile Court (supposedly meeting criteria for enrollment) and almost half of these had one or more previous charges still pending against them in the court. This category of juvenile offender not only proved relatively less amenable to project services than the juvenile experiencing his first court contact, but was less likely to receive a favorable court disposition even with a favorable recommendation from his project counselor. Consequently, in the second phase, we impressed upon court intake officers the necessity of maintaining the project's effectiveness as a pre-trial diversion program, which could only be accomplished by working with those youths who were (1) relatively more amenable to short-term rehabilitative services, and (2) most likely to receive favorable adjudication if successful in the project (i.e., the first offender). The result was a sharp reduction in the number of referrals from court intake officers due, we were told, to the restrictive nature of the criteria when applied only to 16- and 17-year olds. In fact, to appreciably affect the recruitment rate of juvenile first-offenders, it would have been necessary to recruit 13- and 14-year olds, but this was considered incompatible with the manpower orientation of the program.

A related factor which contributed to the decline in juvenile enrollment was the specific delineation of acceptable offense categories in the project's juvenile enrollment criteria, which were formally revised in September 1969 (Appendix B). Just as during Phase I the project enrolled a substantial number of juveniles with prior charges pending, many of the other youths, while first offenders, were charged with felony-type offenses such as robbery, aggravated assault and burglary, which were outside the range of the project's misdemeanant orientation. This group, too, was less likely to receive favorable court action (understandably so, in many cases) solely on the basis of satisfactory project performance. In keeping with the second phase objective of structuring the Juvenile Court program along the lines of our General Sessions Court operation, and in order to secure the Juvenile Court administration's agreement to a standard pre-trial period for participants, specific offense category criteria were delineated and observed. Since these offense criteria did not embrace the range of offenses accepted by the project during Phase I, this, also, reduced the reservoir of 16- and 17-year olds who could be referred to the project.

A third factor which undoubtedly affected the project's effectiveness in the Juvenile Court, though to what extent is not known, was the several changes in supervisory personnel in the project's juvenile component. This undoubtedly affected the readiness of

some court intake officers to refer youths to the project and contributed to the less than whole-hearted commitment of the chief judge to the project's intervention objective. One particularly interesting aspect of the effect of these changes in project relationships with Juvenile Court personnel is illustrated by the following excerpt from a report by the project's third Juvenile Court program supervisor:

> We were assured that the low rate of referrals, two or three a week, was the result only of the absence of eligible youths being processed at court. According to court personnel the trend among young offenders was towards committing their first offenses at a continually younger age and towards committing more and more violent crimes. To establish this we did our own screening of the police complaint sheets to see how many youths actually did fit our criteria. This had two results: (1) it verified the fact that only very few cases seen by the intake section met even our expanded criteria, and (2) it resulted in an even lower rate of referral to the project as the intake workers seemed to have taken offense at our incursion into their sphere of influence. As soon as we stopped the practice of screening names and alerting the intake officers to possible participants, the rate of referrals returned to its previous level of about two per week.

Another factor that may have influenced referrals to the project, though it was not recognized by project staff until the program evaluation stage of Phase II, was the incidence of recidivism among juvenile project participants after leaving the project. The juvenile group overall had a recidivism rate of almost 49%, and first offenders among them had an almost 30% rearrest rate.

The inefficient calendaring procedures at Juvenile Court created frequently the conditions for disrespect to acceptable behavior on the part of delinquent youth since cases took an incredible amount of time to receive final disposition, thus resulting in negative attitudes and a feeling of unreality. *

The chart below presents Project Crossroads juvenile enrollment, by court recruitment source, for both Phase I and Phase II, through September 1970:

JUVENILE COURT RECRUITMENT SOURCE	ENROLLMENT				TOTAL JUVENILE ENROLLMENT
	PHASE I (4/22/68-5/15/69)		PHASE II (5/16/69-9/30/70)		
Intake Division	180	(10)	88	(21)	268
Judge	18	(6)	1	(1)	19
Defense Counsel	3		1		4
Child Support	3	(3)	3	(3)	6
TOTAL	204	(49)*	93	(25)*	297 (74)*

* ( ) = Number whose court cases were already closed when enrolled in the project.

Approximately one-fourth of the juvenile participants enrolled during each phase of the project were not pending judicial action at enrollment, their cases have been closed upon referral to the project by court authorities. Juveniles with no charges pending were provided the same services--counseling, education, employment--as those pending court action and remained enrolled until their counselors felt that their progress (or lack of progress) made further participation unwarranted.

*See Washington Post editorial reproduced in Appendix, p. 53.

PROJECT CROSSROADS PARTICIPANTS

CHARGES AT ENROLLMENT

OFFENSE CATEGORY	ADULTS			JUVENILES			TOTAL PROJECT
	Phase I	Phase II		Phase I	Phase II		
	9-1-68/ 5-15-69	5-16-69/ 9-30-70	ADULT TOTAL	4-15-68/ 5-15-69	5-16-69/ 9-30-70	JUVENILE TOTAL	
Petit Larceny	93	208	301	51	18	69	370 (42%)
UUV/Auto Theft	20	69	89	54	16	70	159 (18%)
False Pretense	3	38	41	--	1	1	42 (5%)
Receiving Stolen Property	9	41	50	--	2	2	52 (6%)
Unlawful Entry & Housebreaking	2	7	9	54	20	74	83 (9%)
Simple Assault	3	7	10	9	3	12	22
Procuring & Prostitution	2	13	15	5	--	5	20
Destruction of Property	10	24	34	3	--	3	37
Robbery	--	--	--	26	20	46	46 (5%)
Weapons	5	2	7	4	1	5	12
Other Misdemeanors or Violations	2	9	11	19	11	30	41 (5%)
Other Felonies	--	--	--	6	--	6	6
Narcotic Offenses	2	1	3	4	1	5	8
TOTALS	151	419	570	235	93	328	898*

*Represents charges pending at time of enrollment against 825 participants--528 adults and 297 juveniles.

IV. EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

A. The Local Manpower Situation

1. The Needs

The manpower needs of the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area must be viewed from the standpoint of the area's differences as well as its similarities to other urban areas of comparable size. Three features not found in any other major U.S. city exist in the District of Columbia: (1) a predominently black population, (2) it is the seat of the Federal Government, and (3) it is a non-self-governing political entity. Similarities with other large cities include the flight of middle and upper income residents to suburban counties, an overburdened transportation system, a decaying educational system, an abnormally high crime rate, and a higher than average unemployment rate among the non-white youth population.

Recent aggregate official employment figures for the District which state that the unemployment rate is lower than the national average hide the truer picture which is portrayed in the sub-employment rate or the percentage of persons who are unemployed, working part-time and earning less than $3,000 per year. A study by the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, dated December 1968, showed the sub-employment rate (SER) among non-whites in the District to be 26.3%. The percentage for both non-white males and females in the 14-21 age group exceeded the above. The SER for whites was 15.9% in the District.

The distribution of employment resources in the District of Columbia is the inverse of that in the nation as a whole. Whereas nationally 30% of employees are engaged in manufacturing and 4% are employed by the Federal Government, the ratio is reversed in Washington. Those firms engaged in manufacturing in the area, in addition to being few in number, are located primarily in suburban counties surrounding the District. The three major bus companies serving Maryland and Virginia suburbs run limited schedules from the inner city, at a high cost to riders. Frequently, a time factor of three hours, round trip, must be added to the standard workday to permit persons from the core city to reach suburban employment opportunities. Discrimination in hiring continues to work to the detriment of black workers when applying for employment in Maryland and Virginia. Additionally, many of the newer firms relocating in suburban Washington require technical skills not possessed by a largely unskilled inner city population.

The Federal Government, while a major source of employment for Washington residents, continues to be unavailable to those without a formal education, people with police records, and the unskilled. Unfortunately, many of the unemployed in the District fall into one or more of these categories. Attempts at restructuring Federal qualifications to include assurances of greater employment of minority group members to date have been largely unsuccessful. And, in spite of efforts to the contrary, black federal employees continue to constitute a disproportionate percentage of lower grade positions.

Employees engaged in service occupations in the District fare poorly because many jobs are related to the seasonal tourist trade in hotels and restaurants. Pay scales for these occupations are among the lowest in the area, working conditions are poor, advancement opportunities are limited, and job security is tenuous.

One development which has the potential for making a substantial impact on the manpower situation was the initiation in December, 1969, of construction on the Metro rapid transit system. The 97-mile system, scheduled to be completed in 1979, will create as many as 5000 jobs during peak construction periods and average 4000 jobs per year during the next decade. The cost of building the system is expected to exceed $2.5 billion (1969-1979), and will result in a local payroll of $50 million in 1970. In

succeeding years construction of the system will yield $1 billion in wages to Washington area workers.*

Unfortunately, existing local craft-training programs have insufficient staff and facilities to provide substantial numbers of inner city workers with the requisite skills to participate in the massive building program envisioned by Metro. An immediate expansion of training is necessary in order to have skilled persons available for employment during the early phases of subway construction. In addition, those persons in age categories marked by high unemployment (16-21 and over 40 years) should be assigned high priorities in both training programs and employment.

The magnitude of the objective of utilizing Washington's underemployed and unemployed black workers in skilled jobs from which they have been historically excluded is illustrated by the fact that black journeymen presently constitute only 4% of the membership in the highly paid District of Columbia craft unions. In addition, the percentage of blacks currently enrolled in union apprenticeship programs, although showing an increase in recent years, is much smaller than their representation in the city's population. Clearly, an alternative to the present system of management and control of craft employment must be devised to provide upward mobility for the unemployed and underemployed black worker. A spokesman for the Washington Area Construction Industry Task Force recently suggested several ways to increase black representation in the building trades. These suggestions included maximum utilization of black construction firms on public projects such as the Metro and urban renewal; easing unrealistic entry requirements into trade unions for workers; and creating programs designed to provide bonding, capital, insurance, and technical assistance for black contractors.

While the construction phase of the Metro prospect offers an opportunity to provide upward mobility, through the building trades, to many of the District's unskilled male workers, other efforts must be geared to the training of personnel to operate the subway once the system is completed. Washington women, especially heads-of-household, should be able to compete for employment in this area. A coordinated program at District high schools, Federal City College, Washington Technical Institute and the area universities should be instituted in preparation for the technical, professional, clerical, and paraprofessional occupations required to run a major urban transit system, many of which could be satisfactorily filled by females.

In short, the Metro system project offers a favorable milieu in which to develop concrete solutions to the District of Columbia's manpower problems. And a successful, comprehensive program geared to the upward mobility of the city's unemployed and underemployed black worker would serve as a model to other urban areas around the country with similar minority group employment problems.

2. Area response

Washington's underemployment problems have been approached from an uncoordinated, poorly planned base, using incomplete data to formulate solutions. The Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS) was established to serve as . . . "A vehicle for a systematic exchange of information among agencies about resources and a means for rational, mutually agreeable adjustment and/or harmonizing of services provided to particular groups by the various programs."** To date, CAMPS' ability to perform this function has not materialized, resulting in a continuation of the hodgepodge of competing manpower programs pursuing separate courses of action. This is not, however, a Washington-only-phenomenon; close coordination will take time.

*Washington Daily News, January 14, 1970, pp. 32 and 44.
**Source: Inter-agency Cooperative Insurance, No. 2, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 3, 1967.

Recent developments, however, have great potential for significantly improving the effectiveness of manpower services to inner city residents, and are being utilized by Project Crossroads. They are:

Metropolitan Area Job Bank

Project Crossroads was the first of local community agencies to be assigned a desk at the Job Bank, a computerized job listing and referral service of the local public employment administration, and has benefited from both the variety and number of jobs accessible through the service. At the inception of the Job Bank (October 1969) and for several succeeding months the project effected multiple daily placements culled from the computerized listing of 2400 daily job orders representing 5000 positions. Since the project was accepted for participation in the Job Bank some 25 other manpower programs have become actively involved, and 10-15 others have trained their personnel with the intention of joining the program.

Participation of the additional agencies has led in recent months to a diminution of available jobs because of the attendant negligible input in job development by these agencies. Unless participating agencies energetically pursue job finding and report new job orders to the Bank, the program's effectiveness will be sharply curtailed. An evaluation is currently underway to determine which occupational areas are particularly suited to the needs of individual participating agencies, with the objective of requesting these agencies to undertake job development in those occupational areas.

Whereas the project referred 20-25 persons per week during the first months of Job Bank operation, referrals since the Spring of 1970 have averaged 5-12 persons per week, with a lower placement rate than formerly achieved. Consequently, employment staff now utilize the Job Bank as an adjunct to job placement rather than as a primary resource for placement of participants. The diminishing role of the Job Bank in the project's placement program may be reversed in the Fall, when summer workers return to school freeing many area jobs.

Job Corps

The Residential Manpower Center began operation in June 1970, offering training in automotive repair, the building trades, heating and air conditioning repair, and the clerical and retail sales fields to males and females between 16 and 22 years of age. The availability of these courses should prove beneficial to trainees because of local manpower needs, the short training periods necessary, and the high earning capacity of persons completing training.

Applicants for training at the Center (capacity 275 persons) have been accepted within two weeks after applying. This short waiting period represents a marked improvement over other local training programs whose prospective trainees lose interest after prolonged waiting periods.

The only apparent drawback to this program is the small stipend paid to trainees--$30 per month, plus allowances--which, unfortunately, will deter persons who need immediate and more sizeable incomes from applying.

Opportunities Industrialization Center

OIC is felt by many to be one of the more viable training facilities operating in Washington. The training offered includes automotive repair, building trades, typing, key punch, and business machine operation. The center's employment retention rate of 85.17% clearly indicates the relevance of training and the skill levels achieved by its trainees. However, project participants have been unable to avail themselves of this

resource in substantial numbers because of the heavy demands of other applicants and a waiting list sometimes exceeding 500 persons. Expansion of OIC's facilities and staff, particularly to the city's northeast and southeast areas, would permit easier access to the program by a greater segment of the community.

Project Build

Construction of the Metro subway system, interstate roadways, housing and office buildings in the Washington area provides an excellent opportunity for meaningful employment in the building trades. Project Build has been preparing young men to enter apprenticeship by tutoring them to meet union requirements that formerly excluded many who applied. The tutorial portion of the program preps youths for GATB exams and/or the GED as required by the craft unions. The effectiveness of Build's preparation of youths is substantiated by a placement rate of 85% of graduates being accepted as apprentices. Retention of apprentices accepted by unions also approximates the national average.

Project Build's current training cycle of 80 youths has been abbreviated to two months to ready trainees for the peak building season. Generally the cycle lasts six months, requiring an applicant to wait for up to that length of time for acceptance. As in the case of OIC, the program has proven to be effective in preparing disadvantaged persons for meaningful employment. Expansion of the Build program to train as many apprentices as the unions can absorb would enhance the manpower situation in Washington, D.C.

Council of Governments' "Capital Flyer"

The U.S. Department of Transportation-funded Capital Flyer express bus service, sponsored by the Metropolitan Council of Governments, has provided access to suburban sources of employment for District of Columbia residents. The bus service features frequent schedules to three of the counties surrounding Washington. Routes were selected to correspond to the location of business complexes having manpower needs. As of June 22, 1970, the Capital Flyer offered the service to Fairfax, Prince Georges, and Montgomery Counties. Surveys of passengers revealed a high degree of dissatisfaction with the service, a marked reduction in travel time to work, and attractive salaries paid to persons employed in the suburbs. Project participants were apprised of these advantages when they were referred to jobs in suburban localities and often used the flyer. At the time of this writing the continued availability of this service is very much in doubt because of lack of funds.

JOBS '70

JOBS '70, a U.S. Department of Labor funded manpower training program, has funds available through the D.C. Manpower Administration for subsidizing on-the-job training of unskilled persons for periods not to exceed 18 months. The program design is very impressive and past performance appears to have been successful in preparing unskilled persons for meaningful employment. The project's manpower specialist has received a commitment from one large area employer to participate in the JOBS '70 program and provide on-the-job training slots for project participants. However, District of Columbia Manpower Administration (DCMA) Task Force personnel have yet to finalize the agreement. Task Force staff shortages, a large demand for negotiations of contracts, and a backlog of pending contracts are given as reasons for delays. Solicitation of new employer/trainers by local manpower specialists should be suspended until the Task Force is able to reduce its workload to a manageable level. Such an approach would lessen the possibility of employers losing interest in signing MA contracts because of excessive time lapses.

Neighborhood Youth Corps

The dearth of training opportunities for the project's 16- and 17-year old first offenders served as an impetus for the project's "letter of intent" (Appendix D) to participate as a sponsor in NYC's on-the-job program. The Youth Corps' current heavy involvement with placement of youths in summer employment has delayed negotiations to finalize the project's entry into the program. The project's access to funds for subsidizing the training of juveniles will be a welcome inducement to employers now reluctant to hire unskilled youths.

B. Project Employment Services

The project's employment staff utilizes a wide variety of placement resources to obtain jobs for participants and the many unenrolled individuals it serves. Most job placements are the result of field development by staff members and newspaper advertisements, but the institutional resources described above have shown promise of playing an increasingly important role in the project's manpower effort.

1. Placement Procedures

There are four stages to a participant's involvement with the project's employment component: intake, referral, placement and follow-up. At intake, the participant is introduced by his counselor to an employment officer who explains the project's employment services and ascertains the youth's employment and educational background. With regard to his qualifications, the employment officer tries to discover every asset that a participant possesses, e.g., prior training received in manpower programs, shop courses that were taken in school, and things learned through the youth's own initiative.

Once this information is elicited, the participant is asked if he desires a specific type of job, and his qualifications are then weighed against his stated preference. If he is underqualified, the employment officer informs him of available means of upgrading his employability: various manpower training programs or, perhaps, test coaching or educational improvement through the project's remedial education section or other community agencies. If his job preference is unrealistic, the participant is encouraged to re-evaluate himself and select a more reasonable immediate employment objective which will be compatible with longer-range occupational improvement. This is often the case with juvenile participants who, though school dropouts and thus full-time labor force participants, are severely circumscribed in their access to labor market opportunities by Child Labor Laws. An example is a 17-year old school dropout who wanted to become a multilith operator. Refusing to return to school, he was finally convinced to accept a messenger's job with a local printing firm and to enroll in night vocational courses offered by the public schools to obtain the necessary basis preparation for his future vocational goal.

Sometimes a participant will indicate a preference for a menial, dead-end type of job, such as dishwasher or janitor. When this occurs, the employment officer will try to establish why the youth has set his sights so low. Almost always, the reason is lack of self-confidence and a history of frustrating labor market experiences. It is then the employment officer's task to develop an "I'll try it" attitude to replace the "I can't do it" one.

When the interviewer is satisfied that the participant sees some relationship between his expressed job preference and long-range labor market goals, the referral process begins. At this stage the employment officer utilizes every resource at his disposal--the Metropolitan Job Bank's computerized listing, established community contacts, newspaper ads, and even new field development--to locate a suitable opening for the participant. When one or several possibilities are discovered, the employment officer contacts the employer(s) by phone to arrange an interview for the participant who is given a Crossroads referral card to be filled out and returned by the employer after the interview. The employment officer will then coach the participant on what to expect and how to

conduct himself in the interview situation. If it is apparent that the applicant will be unable to project himself in the job interview, his counselor or an employment officer will accompany him to the meeting. Participants are provided with money or bus tokens for transportation to and from employment interviews, and once a participant is placed he may receive a grant from the project's emergency fund to defray expenses during the period prior to his first paycheck.

The referral procedure continues until the participant is placed. As might be expected, it is often not possible to immediately secure the specific job desired by a participant. When this occurs, the participant is encouraged to accept an available position for the time being, with the understanding that the employment staff will replace him when the appropriate opening arises. Participants in this "temporary placement" situation often decline replacement when the job or training originally requested is available. For those who desire and accept replacement, the employment staff makes every effort to immediately place a qualified participant in the vacated position to avoid inconvenience to the employer from the turnover.

After a participant is placed, and his wage and duties have been verified with the employer, the employment staff maintains contacts with his job situation through weekly reviews with project counselors who are primarily responsible for on-the-job follow-ups of participants. At these reviews, changes in a participant's wages or duties are recorded and decisions are sometimes made, based on an evaluation of work performance and other pertinent factors, to upgrade an individual's employment status by replacing him. If it is discovered that a participant has left a job, either voluntarily or non-voluntarily, he is called in for an interview with an employment officer and his counselor. The youth may then be immediately replaced or coached for a time on attitude and responsibilities, depending on the circumstances of his leaving the job. If an employment officer learns that a participant is having on-the-job difficulties, he may request an interview with the youth's employer to try to resolve the problem. This intervention with employers has sometimes resulted in the rehiring of dismissed participants, and employers generally have exhibited a surprising degree of understanding of the needs and problems of the inner city youths served by the project.

2. Employer Contacts

The procedures for dealing with employers differ widely depending on the employer, the kind of job, the qualifications of the participant, and a number of other factors.

First of all, most training referrals are made with or through another agency. Such a referral is usually made by contacting the recruiting agency by phone and discussing the individual with a counselor there before sending him for an interview. In some cases, such as apprenticeship programs, the referral must be preceded by some form of testing (i.e., the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) administered by the public employment service (MTESA).

Job referrals, on the other hand, are most often made to individual employers with whom project staff have dealt in the past or who were discovered through the Job Bank. Sometimes this means that the employment officers will call an employer who may or may not have an opening but hires in the general field desired. Most often, however, the call is made to someone who has advertised in the Job Bank that he has an opening or to an employer who keeps the project informed of his openings as they occur.

If the employment officer is dealing with an employer who knows Crossroads, he will establish that the job is still open and proceed to discuss the applicant and his qualifications for the specific job. In non-sensitive jobs (such as labor jobs where the participant's court involvement is of no consequence) the officer will spend his time discussing the applicant's work history, age, height, weight, transportation arrangements, etc. If the job sought is a cashier or stock clerk's position, the employer may want to talk about any arrest or conviction and will often rule out participants with such charges as

petit larceny or illegal use of a credit card. This is when the employment officer must do his best work on his most difficult task, since the employer is convinced that the first offender has proven himself a bad risk as an employee. The employment officer will try to offset this attitude by expressing his belief in the applicant and describing the supportive services available through the project. Often the employer will be able to see that if the employee is reporting weekly to his counselor, he will be trying his best to do well on the job.

Another frequent barrier with employers is the age and presumed instability of the younger participants. The employment officer often has to reassure employers that the 18- or 19-year old can and will be a stable employee.

Some employers, of course, are not familiar with Crossroads and there is no rule to follow when deciding whether or not to describe the project. It often depends on something as subtle as the sound of the employer over the phone. At other times the employer will ask about a police record. It is important to remember at this point that the Crossroads participant still has a clean record (for public purposes) because a conviction has not been entered against him in court.

Once the referral is made, the employment officer will call the employer within a couple of days to determine the outcome of the interview. If the applicant is not hired, the officer will find out why and try to correct the problem for the next referral. If the man is hired, there may be no need for the employment officer to do any formal follow-up after verifying the placement because the youth's counselor will be making weekly contacts with the participant both at home and on the job. Since the counselor will be making periodic contact with the participant on the job, it may be desirable for the counselor to contact the employer directly but this is by no means always necessary.

Contact between the project's employment staff and employers throughout the city is not restricted to discussions of individual applicants. In order to open up new jobs, communication and education efforts are conducted on a broader basis with leaders of the business community. Drug Fair, TRW Systems, and the C & P Telephone Company are all examples of firms whose managers have been approached by project staff and have demonstrated a commitment to the belief that a history of court involvement does not mean a man cannot be a stable, responsible employee.

Most small employers do not have the capacity to provide skill training like the larger firms, but they can still provide good jobs with steady pay and advancement. Of course, there are small businesses which shy away at a hint of police involvement by a job applicant but they, too, will sometime respond to a description of the philosophy and objectives of Project Crossroads.

Finally, whether it be a large or small company, the project staff's relationship with an employer must be one of trust and mutual benefit if it is to continue to be useful to both parties.

3. Employment Assistance to Non-Enrollees

Throughout the nearly three years of project operation, the employment staff has made almost as many placements for non-enrollees as it has for official participants (466 versus 517). This ex-officio service was in part a consequence of NCCY's previous (1966-68) program of prisoner rehabilitation, Project Challenge, at the District of Columbia's Lorton Youth Center. Men who had been enrolled in Challenge or who were at Lorton during its existence began turning up at the new Crossroads office for employment assistance even before the project had begun its court operations.

Former Lorton inmates and parole officer referrals were the predominant group of non-enrollees served by the employment staff for the first six months of the project. Soon, however, Crossroads earned a reputation of its own in the community as an employment

resource particularly capable of helping unemployed or underemployed individuals with police records. Consequently the "unofficial participant" group was substantially increased to a rate of 15-20 per month. Most were young men and women with arrest and conviction records who had difficulty finding decent employment because of their handicap, and this group included defendants whose cases were currently being processed but who fell outside of the Crossroads enrollment criteria. Juvenile Court and General Sessions Court probation officers also referred many of their clients to the project for employment or educational assistance. Many of the people who sought job or training placement through Project Crossroads, however, were simply disadvantaged, unemployed men and women with no criminal background who were either unsuccessful in obtaining assistance from the public employment service or who simply preferred the relatively informal and uncomplicated placement assistance and employment counseling available through the project.

Probation Department Referrals

In October 1970, the project began servicing persons referred for employment assistance by the D.C. Department of Probation on an official basis. This additional responsibility, with its concomitant record keeping and reporting obligations, was undertaken for the dual purpose of familiarizing project staff with court administrative procedures (in anticipation of the project's incorporation into the court system at the end of the year) and increasing the effectiveness of probationary services.

Approximately eight probationers per week were serviced by the employment staff during the first two months of operation under the new arrangement. Most probation referrals are serviced through the Project Crossroads desk at the Job Bank; some, however, are referred directly to jobs developed by the employment staff. The steady flow of Probation Department referrals has resulted in a sharp reduction in project employment assistance to other "non-enrollees." It is planned, however, that the employment staff will be increased in size after project absorption into the new Superior Court and will be able to resume service to more of the people who, though in need of assistance, are too often precluded from one resource or another by some deficiency in their "eligibility."

C. Employment Characteristics of Participants While Enrolled

1. Overview

As of September 30, 1970, the employment staff had effected 983 placements including 517 for project participants and 466 for individuals not enrolled but requesting employment assistance. Most of the latter group were referred by other community agencies, by probation officers, or by friends who had been placed through the project; many others were just "walk-ins." Overall, the employment staff averaged about 38 placements per month, and approximately 40% of these were training or pre-vocational placements.

Three hundred seventy-two of the participants enrolled during both phases of the project were placed directly by the employment staff, 122 (33%) of them two or more times. The replacement rate for second phase participants (27%) was substantially lower than the 44% rate of Phase I, and was due primarily to (1) a much smaller enrollment of juvenile participants, who were relatively more unstable in their labor market behavior than adult enrollees, (2) better job placements and higher starting salaries compared to the first phase, and (3) less training program placements which have a substantially higher turnover than job placements. These factors are reflected in the figures on average number of jobs per participant during the second phase--juveniles averaged 1.6 jobs per man and adults 1.1 per man while enrolled. The Phase I rates were 1.6 and 1.3, respectively.

Accounting for the 453 enrollees not placed directly by the staff: 119 were either employed at enrollment and remained in those jobs (most of them because of project intervention with their employers), found employment on their own initiative, or were placed through other agencies; 173 were full-time students for the entire period of their

enrollment (about 40 of whom were placed in part-time jobs); 43, many of them females, were unavailable for employment while enrolled, either because of medical problems or family commitments; and 118 youths were unemployed and out of school for the entire period of their project enrollment, most of them unfavorably terminated participants.

The average quarterly employment rate for adult participants during Phase II (85%) was substantially higher than that for juveniles (64%), and the difference was greater than during Phase I. Must of this is attributable to the financial and other problems experienced by local youth-oriented work-training programs in the city (notably the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Washington Job Center programs) throughout the fall and winter of 1969, and a very tight summer job market in 1970, both of which limited employment opportunities for the 16- and 17-year old participants.

The employment staff has made a total of 1243 job and training referrals on behalf of enrollees since the beginning of the project, resulting in one placement for every 2.4 referrals. There was a smaller proportion of placements to referrals during the second half of the program (1:2.8) than during the first half (1:2.2), partly as a result of the employment and counseling staff's encouragement of greater selectivity in job acceptance by participants. Access to the Job Bank's computerized listing of job openings was also a factor, substantially expanding the job vacancy base for referrals.

The average first job starting wage for participants was $2.05 per hour during Phase II. The average wage at termination (or on last job held) was $2.18 per hour. Both the beginning and last wage rates during enrollment were approximately 20% higher than the respective rates for Phase I, with adult participants experiencing the greater increase.

Finally, 79% of all project enrollees were in full-time job, training or school programs at the time of their leaving the project during Phase II. The first phase rate was 72%. The following chart presents a summary of Crossroads participants' employment characteristics during Phase I and through September 1970 of Phase II:

EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF ENROLLEES

	Phase I			Phase II (Through Sept. 30, 1970)		
	Juveniles	Adults	Total	Juveniles	Adults	Total
Number Employed*	121	108	229	51	211	262
Total Jobs Held	196	138	334	79	273	316
Training or Pre-Voc. Positions (Percent of Total)	43%	54%	48%	42%	31%	34%
Average Number Jobs per Enrollee	1.6	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.1	1.2
First Job Average Hourly Wage	$1.59	$ 1.83	$1.70	$1.72	$2.16	$2.05
Last Job Average Hourly Wage	$1.62	$1.94	$1.77	$1.85	$2.30	$2.18
Average Quarterly Employment Rate	69%	82%	75%	64%	85%	79%
Percent Employed or in School at Termination	70%	78%	72%	63%	85%	79%

*Included 372 placed directly by the project staff and 119 who obtained jobs through other sources.

V. COUNSELING

The least structured but, at the same time, most crucial aspect of participation in Project Crossroads is the relationship established and maintained between the participant and his assigned community worker (counselor). Throughout the three-month participation period, it is the community worker's task to identify the needs of the youthful participant, to coordinate the application of project and other community services to those needs, and to do this in such a way that the provision and purpose of those services are perceived by the participant as non-authoritarian and directed to his present and future personal improvement. This is not an easy task.

The pre-trial period is one of great anxiety for the average enrollee. To the exigencies of his everyday life in the neighborhood have been added an apprehension about the uncertainties of the criminal justice system to which he will soon be held accountable and the obligation, albeit voluntary, of "proving" himself in a program which can have a decisive effect on the outcome and consequences of his court involvement. Given this frame of mind, it is not too difficult to get a participant to accept a job or training position which the project staff has developed for him or, perhaps, to convince him to undertake two nights of remedial education each week to prepare for a high school equivalency diploma examination--he sees this related to a "break" in court. To get him to maintain an employment, training or education program over a protracted period, however, to convince him that these project services are not simply mechanical, authoritarian demands but directed to his present and future personal improvement, requires something more than routine processing through employment and educational programs. It is the function of the project's counseling component--five community worker-counselors and one supervisor--to stimulate this long-term and more concrete "success."

The community worker tries to make the participant realize that his project program is a joint endeavor with the counselor and to establish a personal relationship with the youth so that his advice is sought and, hopefully, followed. It has been one of the underlying assumptions of the Crossroads program that these goals are best achieved through the use of non-professional counseling personnel with backgrounds similar to those of the population served. The staff itself feels that an essential prerequisite to serving a participant's needs and achieving more than a superficial degree of attitudinal and behavioral change is to provide him with a supportive person with whom he can become emotionally involved. It is much easier to create this essential rapport and involvement when the community worker has the personal and experiential background to empathize with the participant, while at the same time providing an image to the youth of trustworthiness, understanding and demonstrated self-improvement.

With the emphasis on personal relationships between community workers and participants, the project's counseling is conducted almost exclusively on a one-to-one basis; group counseling has been utilized only sporadically. Community workers are expected to have at least one personal contact per week with each participant in their respective caseloads, preferably in the youth's home or neighborhood. Job site visits or contacts at school are also encouraged if circumstances permit; in any event, the community worker is also expected to periodically contact a participant's work supervisor or school counselor to keep abreast of the youth's progress in these areas and to address any difficulties the participant may be having consciously or unconsciously. In addition to the weekly personal contact, telephone contacts are encouraged. Both the telephone and personal contacts described here are, of course, suggested minimums, and contacts between community workers and participants are made as frequently (or infrequently) as the participant and/or the counselor deem desirable. In a typical week, for an active caseload of 79 participants, the project's five community workers made 86 personal contacts, 41 telephone contacts and four referrals to community agencies with participants, in addition to their other duties of screening and intake interviewing. These contacts do not include those had with participants by the project's employment or educational staffs.

The absence of group counseling in the Crossroads program was of some concern to program administrators during Phase I, since it is generally regarded as a valuable tool in attitude and behavior modification through structured peer group contact and interchange. It is also felt that periodic group meetings would facilitate counselor-participant contacts. Consequently, a special group counseling orientation course for project staff was arranged with Federal City College in the last months of Phase I in the hope that this familiarization would instigate staff experimentation with group meetings. As it turned out, however, the experimentation was short-lived and counselors remained convinced of the expediency and relevance of the one-to-one approach as the best means of establishing the desired relationship with, and having the greatest impact on, the youth project participants.

They maintained that since Crossroads was primarily an employment oriented program, to insist that participants attend periodic group counseling sessions was placing too much of a demand on their free time after an eight-or ten-hour workday. In addition, it would tend to weaken the informal and personal relationship between counselor and participant and would add nothing to the counselor's knowledge about the problems and attitude of the participants, since such information was much more likely to be disclosed in the course of personal counseling. Even if group counseling was required, participants (as experience proved) would not attend, and what was the recourse? Unfavorable termination would be capricious if the participant had carried out the other obligations of his project participation satisfactorily and showed definite improvement. If there were no official sanctions, few if any participants would show up for the meetings with a resultant waste of time for the one or two who did show up and for the community worker who could have put the time and the preparation into additional field work activity.

Although some of this resistance to a group counseling program undoubtedly was the result of the staff's lack of familiarity and facility with group guidance techniques, their primary motivation was both sincere (in that they believe one-to-one counseling is most effective in achieving positive change over a short period of time) and practical (participants just wouldn't attend). In view of the deep-rooted feelings among the staff and their apparent success with the large majority of participants, particularly the adult defendants, and because staff changes during Phase II resulted in only two of the five community workers who originally attended the group counseling class remaining, group sessions were encouraged but not insisted upon throughout most of the second phase.

The following excerpt on counseling from the project's staff manual,* written by the counselors themselves, reflects the philosophy which permeated the program:

> We may ask why use non-professionals in lieu of professionally trained people? It is believed that the non-professional has personal experiences about the welfare and health problems, along with the other needs relating to the target population, they also are able to better relate and empathize. Essential to the fulfillment of a client's needs is a person (community worker) with whom he can become emotionally involved. Unless the client becomes involved with at least one person in a better way than he is now involved with anyone, he will be unable to fulfill his needs. How do we meet this challenge? It is mandatory that we know more about this person. One approach is scheduling planned visits to the home, meet the families, offer assistance and services that may be available through community resources known to the project. A community worker's sincerity can be met with resistance, seen as testing the community worker's sincerity, because the participant has been disappointed so many times in the past. This brings out some of the qualities a community worker should possess: (a) responsibility, toughness, interest, humaness, sensitiveness to the needs of others; (b) fairness--the community worker has to accept

*Project Crossroads Staff Manual, pp. 11-14.

participants uncritically and must try to understand their behavior; (c) become involved; (d) must make client face reality--the community worker must care enough about his client to reject behavior which won't help him fulfill his needs; and (e) give praise and show disapproval when necessary. A community worker must remember that everything relates to a person's life--his hopes, fears, opinions, and his values of right and wrong. He must expand the range of interest and enlarge his horizon, make a client aware of life goals beyond his immediate difficulties. Some other attributions a community worker should possess and be capable of instilling in the client's thought is an awareness of consumer needs: how to buy, where to buy, and credit buying; to help the client understand the real world and to help him fulfill his needs for acceptable behavior so he will have no need to deny reality again. Through group counseling, the community worker will discuss the need to have respect for others and the basis of good citizenship, facing up to and tackling mutual problems together provide group members with firsthand, positive experiences. Through individual counseling, the community worker must be a leader to his client (If he isn't, who will be?). He examines with the participant his daily activity and suggests better ways to behave and to obtain rewards, and by making the client aware, he will instill a realistic assessment of the necessity of keeping within a budget, ways of spending for essential obligations and plan for personal recreation.

This raises the question of, "What are some of the qualifications of a community worker?". A community worker should need to feel that he is worthwhile to himself and to others. To be a worthwhile person, he must maintain a satisfactory standard of behavior. He must learn to correct himself when he does wrong and to credit himself when he does right. If he does not evaluate his own behavior, he cannot help others. The only way by which a person can be motivated to change is to look honestly at his own behavior.

The project's reputation is the responsibility of every member of the staff. They share alike in critical comments and the recognition of their achievements.

The community worker should possess qualities of stability, dependability, responsibility, and reliability. These are the most frequently stressed positive characteristics. He must also be punctual in keeping appointments, filing reports, and keeping promises he makes. He should have self-discipline to accept court and project rules. If a person cannot follow a schedule, keep appointments, or complete certain administrative tasks, he will confuse more than help. He should be dedicated and willing to listen and learn.

The relatively unstructured counseling approach utilized by Project Crossroads has evoked more comment from observers than any other operational feature of the program, particularly because, save for a brief period during Phase I, there has been no psychologist or other professional to supervise the counseling effort. While we do not recommend this one approach to every offender rehabilitation program utilizing non-professional staff, we feel that its proven worth in the Crossroads program commends at least further experimentation with this method, perhaps in a research framework with traditional therapeutic counseling techniques so that its relative effectiveness can be readily measured.

Emergency Fund

A very necessary addition to the project's supportive services during the second half of project operations was the creation of an emergency fund for special participant needs. Because our earlier experiences pointed up the need for emergency financial assistance to many participants, whether for rent, transportation, food, or tools or uniforms for their new found jobs, a fund in the amount of $3,000 was requested and obtained from the Manpower Administration.

Grants from the fund were limited to a maximum of $35 per individual and could only be obtained upon a written request from the participant's counselor stating the need and the approval of the counseling supervisor. The majority of requests were for rent, emergency assistance, and food money, but a substantial number of participants also needed initial carfare for transportation to and from work prior to receiving their first paycheck; others needed tools or uniforms for their jobs. In addition, all those participating in our education program who applied for the high school equivalency diploma examination, administered by the Board of Education, received assistance for the payment of examination fees and books, to reinforce their motivation and overcome their reluctance to take advantage of educational opportunities.

The existence of the fund greatly facilitated project service to participants and complemented the limited available public and private resources in the city for emergency assistance. While the amount required would vary and depend on the special needs of the project and its geographical location, we recommend that other pre-trial intervention programs utilize this method of assistance and include in their budgets a contingency fund for participants.

VI. EDUCATION SERVICES

A. VISTA Utilization

NCCY had utilized a VISTA component in its Project Challenge* MDTA program of inmate rehabilitation (1966-1968) with much success. Consequently, a contingent of seven VISTA volunteers was requested from OEO for assignment to NCCY's Crossroads effort. It had been our experience in the prior program (as in this one) that the youth of the volunteers, their interest in working with socially and economically handicapped individuals, and their academic training complemented the qualities of the paid staff, both professional and paraprofessional. In addition, VISTA volunteers frequently present the first opportunity for inner-city black youth to have meaningful relationships with whites.

Although it was originally planned that the VISTAs be engaged primarily in educational and cultural programs for Crossroads participants, early attempts were made to use some of the volunteers as counselors, at their own request. These attempts generally proved disappointing for both clients and volunteer-counselor, however, because of the latter's difficulty in relating to disadvantaged black youth in a close, personal counseling role. Furthermore, the volunteers lacked prior experience in counseling and generated a certain amount of resentment of their efforts on the part of the paraprofessional staff. Once the volunteers voiced their own doubts about their performance and effectiveness as counselors, their use in those roles was discontinued, and all VISTA involvement in the project became centered on educational remediation and related activities for participants.

B. The Program

The Project Crossroads education program, established and administered by VISTA volunteers, offers tutorial services in subjects ranging from remedial reading and math to the high school equivalency diploma for project enrollees, for non-enrollees referred from the Juvenile Court and Court of General Sessions, and other youths from the community who either request or are referred for services. Tutors are recruited from the ranks of government and private industry and from area colleges and universities and are assigned to pupils on a one-to-one basis. Meetings of about two hours in duration are arranged for the tutor and pupil twice weekly at the project office. Special arrangements are sometimes made for tutoring at the pupil's home. The project provides the necessary educational materials for tutoring except when a participant requires assistance with his regular schoolwork and standard texts are used. Most participants in the education program are teenagers, but range from 12 years to 45 years of age and are predominantly male. For the 18 years and older group, the VISTAs have developed special preparatory courses for those interested in passing various job-related tests, such as the GATB (General Aptitude Test Battery), which are frequently prerequisites to employment or to enrollment in manpower training or union apprenticeship programs.

During Phase II the project's education component served 166 participants and other youths, providing a total of 3245 hours of tutorial instruction. The total number of tutoring hours provided during both phases of the project was 6295. In addition, eight participants were provided financial assistance to enroll in college, 47 juveniles were re-enrolled in full-time school programs, and 18 participants were successfully assisted in obtaining high school equivalency diplomas.

C. Procedures

At least one VISTA covers the education section every morning to accept referrals, explain the program, test prospective students, tutor, research new materials, and

*Project Challenge, Final Report--National Committee for Children and Youth, 1968.

perform administrative tasks. Whenever possible, afternoons are reserved for recruiting new tutors, acquiring needed materials, and more preparation for the evening tutoring. From late afternoon through evening at least two VISTAs are required: one for coordinating tutors and their students by telephone and the other to help with this important task and later to do some pick-ups with the VISTA car.

On either Monday and Wednesday or Tuesday and Thursday evenings, tutors meet with their pupils at the Crossroads office from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Tutors usually provide their own transportation, although the VISTAs attempt to coordinate some rides. It is expected that students try to provide their own transportation, but when necessary and wherever possible, the VISTA car was used to pick up students. Most of the pick up is limited to southeast Washington and the near northeast. Chairs, desks, pencils and paper, and educational materials are provided at the project.

When a youth is first referred for education services, he or she is interviewed by one of the VISTAs. Information concerning current educational status and academic and occupational goals is sought. General impressions of the youth are recorded with an eye toward placement with an appropriate tutor. Also, certain educational tests* are usually administered to determine the approximate level at which the individual needs work. This information is placed in a file which is at the tutor's disposal. All subsequent progress reports from tutors and all tests taken are kept in this file.

Although lacking the structure of rewards and sanctions found in the conventional public school (e.g., grades, credit, peer group approval, teacher's discipline), the project education program does not seek a substitute for the conventional classroom situation, but a more effective way of involving the student in the learning process as painlessly and as enjoyably as possible. Ideally, this is achieved through a shared commitment between a tutee and his tutor. Commitment implies some process of prior evaluation, rational or otherwise, on the part of those involved. The extent to which something "happens" between tutor and pupil is important. This philosophy is exemplified in the following excerpt from a VISTA volunteer's report on the education program.

> "Attitude" has been a major bone of contention in the education section because it includes the very basis of one's approach to tutoring. The question which this section will attempt to answer is, "Are we trying to elicit a basic change in the individual's attitude toward academics, or are we trying to transmit some basic educational skills?"
>
> First, let's see what it means to change a tutee's attitude. The typical prospective student has nothing but contempt for school, the classroom, and academics in general. Accordingly, this poor attitude tends to negate any skills which he might have picked up along the way. That is, due to sub-cultural influences the prospective participant of the education section has no use for the school scene.
>
> The most typical reaction to the suggestion that he pick up a high school equivalency diploma is that of passive inaction. The implication seems to be that the school experience is remembered as embarrassment, threat of failure, and boredom. All this previous dissatisfaction with academics only causes him to case further aspersions on those who are successful in such areas (and to reinforce the concept of the successful student) as being a "pansy" type. This reaction, further reinforced by the particular peer group sub-culture which lives by the codes of the street, finally shows us how fruitless it would be for us to attempt changing this entire syndrome of poor attitudes directly.

*Standard Achievement Test; Job Corps Reading Test; and Job Corps Mathematice Diagnostic Test.

The one-to-one aspect of our program does much to break this hostility down, but more important yet is the content of this relationship. If we are stressing attitude, the implication is that there will be much in the way of counseling and non-directive "therapy;" any "work" that is accomplished will be secondary and at the discretion of the tutee. Although this style sounds ideal, we neither have the resources nor the time for such a direct attitudinal approach. Most obviously, our tutors, being white, middle-class volunteers, for the most part, are neither prepared nor qualified for such a program, nor do they have the time needed to fulfill such an endeavor. Also, keeping in mind that it took the participant 16 or more years to formulate his attitudes and values, it would be rather presumptuous for us to think that we could alter them significantly with the given situation and in a limited time.

However, all is not lost! Although the alternative procedure may be less ambitious and less romantic, it is not quite as sterile as it might appear. That is, in shifting the priority to a more specialized approach towards basic educational skills needed for concrete success in one area, as opposed to working in a counseling relationship with the whole person, we have to affect the individual's attitude, <u>indirectly</u>.

For instance, a junior high school student is referred to us from Juvenile Court. We find out that he is doing poorly in most of his subjects, that he has this negative attitude toward academics, and that he is reading at a fourth grade level. Within the one-to-one setting we work entirely on reading. Eventually, when his reading comprehension and speed improve, he is no longer embarrassed to read aloud and will even pick up a magazine occasionally. After overcoming this great hurdle, he has gained some degree of confidence (previously absent) and some satisfaction (reward), in the form of accomplishment which will be likely to predispose him more favorably toward academics in general. (Incidentally, in math the same procedure is followed with the multiplication tables as the basis.) Also, this latter approach is likely to utilize contact with teachers as a means of improving academic achievement and thereby instilling more confidence.

The effect of this kind of indirect approach to achieve attitudinal change can be seen when a participant who is still in school boasts of his new academic achievements, or when the dropout realizes his goal of a GED and the commensurate employment rewards.

D. <u>Problems</u>

Several problems have been encountered by the VISTAs in the operation of their education program: First, because most of the tutoring has taken place on a one-to-one basis there has been a constant need for new tutors. Secondly, as VISTAs have become increasingly aware of the educational needs and desires of Crossroads participants and others involved in the tutoring program, it has become apparent that more than just another GED tutoring project is needed. More specifically, many of the women being tutored for their high school equivalency diplomas also desired nurse's aide training and many of the men desired training in brick masonry and carpentry. The problem has been that they couldn't find training programs that didn't require an upgrading of their educational levels. Third, it has been extremely difficult to keep Crossroads participants motivated toward the goal of a GED. Finally, expansion of the education program has been hampered by very limited funds.

In an effort to find solutions to the first three of these problems the VISTAs have contacted many other tutoring projects in Washington in order to discover new resources for tutors and discuss how innovative teaching techniques may be implemented. Directors of most tutoring projects face the problems of tutor shortages and discontinued student motivation, and most project directors realize the need for a service that offers more than just tutoring toward the GED for those students with interests that extend beyond their obtaining this diploma.

VISTAs have begun to work toward a solution to at least two of the problems they face in the operation of the education component of Project Crossroads by developing a central tutoring referral service. The purpose of this service has been the placing of project participants and others into tutoring or job training programs best suited to their educational needs and desires. Another aspect of this service has been the placing of volunteer tutors into other education programs in Washington, D.C. Probation officers from both the General Sessions and Juvenile Courts have been informed of the center's services and several now use it regularly as a resource in fulfilling the educational needs of the people on their caseloads.

The VISTAs have also submitted a proposal to Federal City College suggesting that it take over the operation and further development of the referral service. The volunteers feel that this arrangement would better serve other community tutoring projects because students on a work-study program could more easily perform necessary research and FCC has a more abundant supply of tutors in its student body than Project Crossroads.

The problem of keeping Crossroads participants motivated toward the goal of a GED and the problem of funding continue to exist. The volunteers' proposed solution to the motivational problem is the following: "Initiate a tightly coordinated program between the employment section and the education section whereby the participant who comes into Crossroads lacking a high school diploma, or the appropriate educational level to qualify for a desired position, will be tutored on a full-time basis until he is adequately prepared for the position. Ideally, to make such a service feasible, stipends would have to be paid in order to provide an immediate incentive to complete the specified educational program and to relieve the pressure to obtain immediate income-earning employment." Other motivational techniques, including a Black Studies program, are presently being tried in the education component.

As was stated in the project's final report on Phase I, a policy decision was made not to utilize VISTA volunteers in the counseling component of Project Crossroads during Phase II because they are white, middle-class, and experientially alien to the participant group: "Given the difference in life styles between the project population of inner city youths and that of VISTAs, it would be, if not impossible, at least extremely difficult for the latter to attain the requisite sensitivity to be effective counselors." The feeling on the part of the majority of the present contingent of volunteers is that the above completely ignores the first requirement placed upon VISTAs; that is, that they gain the "requisite sensitivity" needed to work among the poor. It is for this reason, they point out, that VISTAs take up residence in the ghettoes and live on a bare subsistence salary. There is no doubt that some VISTAs attached to Crossroads have been able to gain the "requisite sensitivity" needed to be counselors. The volunteers, however, have come to realize that the majority of the Crossroads staff believe in the above policy statement, and that to utilize VISTAs as counselors could possibly result in unnecessary division among the staff which would be detrimental to the project and its participants.

Another implication of this apparent inconsistency involves the future effectiveness of utilizing VISTAs at Crossroads. The majority of the present contingent of VISTAs maintain that they have not joined VISTA to carry on the programs which have been established by others, but to act as catalysts; to play effective roles in getting various communities to instigate new programs which will benefit the people of that community. There has also been some doubt raised as to how effectively middle-class volunteers have been able to convince black, inner city youths who have dropped out of high school that there are benefits to being properly educated.

With these questions in mind, the present contingent of VISTAs recommends that the education section be staffed by one black, salaried specialist in remedial education and by work-study students from the Federal City College, Howard University and/or D.C. Teachers College, as well as by qualified whites. This would maximize the project's efforts to improve the educational levels of its participants by having more blacks who have not been discouraged by education dealing with the educational problems of project participants, and by giving operational control of the educational component to indigenous staff. This, hopefully, also would have the effect of offsetting any negative aspects of maintaining a white, middle-class, and isolated education component.

If the preceding recommendations were adopted, the VISTAs feel that they could then serve other components of the "court community:" educational programs could be set up in halfway houses, jails, and other penal institutions, and a coordinated program could be established which would serve the educational needs of all people at various stages of the criminal justice system. If this is not a real need or if it is an impractical objective, the present group of volunteers feels that VISTAs should be phased out of Crossroads involvement.

The several recommendations of the VISTA contingent discussed above are presently being considered for implementation when project operations are transferred to the District of Columbia court system.

VII. DIVERSION AND RECIDIVISM

A. Diversion

The young offenders enrolled in Project Crossroads are eventually terminated either "favorably" or "unfavorably" after a period of project participation. Favorable termination means that a participant's counselor has evaluated his project performance as very satisfactory and recommends favorable court action in the participant's case. Unfavorable termination means that the participant's counselor has evaluated his performance as unsatisfactory and sees no merit in the youth's continued participation in the project. The participant so terminated reverts to normal court processing on his pending case, without prejudice, and receives no recommendation for favorable court action from his counselor. Unfavorable terminations are generally the result of one or a combination of several factors: chronic uncooperativeness with the counselor and other project staff; unwillingness to maintain an employment, training or school program; commission of a new offense; and abscondance.

The standard period of project participation is 90 days for adult participants, each of whom receives a three-month trial date continuance at the time of enrollment. There are two exceptions to the length of participation for adult enrollees: (1) A participant may be terminated unfavorably at any time after enrollment, and in fact most such terminations occur within the first two months. Since defense counsel is notified of all such actions, he may obtain a vacation of the original 90-day continuance in his client's case and move up the trial date. (2) In exceptional cases the project may request defense counsel and the court to extend the pre-trial period to permit more time for the project staff to work with the participant. The usual extension period requested is one month, after which time the participant will be either favorably or unfavorably terminated.

Throughout most of the project, there was no standard participation period for juvenile participants, as the administrative procedures in Juvenile Court precluded obtaining a specific court hearing date for participants at the time of their enrollment. When the cases of juvenile participants finally were calendared, the hearing dates would range anywhere from one to twelve months after enrollment. Although this system was improved during Phase II by an agreement with the Juvenile Court, under which new enrolees would receive a hearing date approximately three months after enrollment, the change came too late to affect the vast majority of juvenile participants. Consequently, when a juvenile who had performed satisfactorily in the project had not received a court hearing within five months of enrollment, he was officially terminated and his counselor's recommendation for favorable court action forwarded to the court for consideration at his eventual hearing. As in the case of adult participants, unfavorable termination of a juvenile could occur at any time after enrollment.

As of the end of September 1970, 750 participants had completed their Crossroads program--517 of whom were favorably terminated and 233 unfavorably terminated. Approximately 55% of the juveniles and 77% of the adult participants received favorable terminations. A total of 467 participants had their charges dismissed, representing 62% of all terminations--76% of the adults and 40% of the juveniles. The following chart presents the total numbers of juvenile and adult participants terminated and the numbers successfully diverted from criminal or delinquency prosecution during both stages of the project:

	TERMINATIONS			PARTICIPANTS DIVERTED (Charges Dismissed at Termination)		
	Total	Favorable	Unfavorable	Number	% of Total Terminated	% of Favorable Terminations
PHASE I (1/15/68-5/15/69						
Adults	99	69	30	69	70%	100%
Juveniles	144	85	59	67	46%	79%
PHASE II (5/16/69-9/30/70						
Adults	366	290	76	287	78%	99%
Juveniles	141	73	68	44	31%	60%
TOTAL PROJECT						
Adults*	465	359	106	356	76%	99%
Juveniles	285	158	127	111**	40%	70%
TOTAL	750	517	233	467	62%	90%

*Excludes one adult participant who died while enrolled during phase II.

**Includes 72 juveniles whose charges were dropped upon their enrollment in the project, whether terminated favorably or unfavorably.

As indicated above, General Sessions Court authorities followed the project's recommendation for favorable court action in the cases of 356 out of 359 favorably terminated participants. In the three cases in which the United States Attorney's Office did not follow the project's recommendation: one of the participants was discovered to have been using an alias, one was a marijuana possession case which the U.S. Attorney's Office felt was unwise to nol pross (decline prosecution of) at that particular time, and the third was an instance of business community reaction to a particular shoplifter's being allowed to enroll in the project. All three cases occurred very early in the program and over the past 18 months every recommendation by the project as to favorable disposition has been acquiesced in by the U.S. Attorney's Office.

Because the statistics on juveniles in the chart above include 72 youths whose Juvenile Court cases were closed upon their entering the project, the apparent correlation of 70% between favorable termination and successful diversion is somewhat misleading. The diversion total of 111 juveniles includes 26 youths whose cases were closed by the court at enrollment but who were subsequently terminated unfavorably. Adjusting for this, the correlation between favorable termination and dismissal is a relatively low 54%, (85 out of 158), due primarily to the fact that many of the 158 favorably terminated juveniles did not receive judicial hearings by the time of their termination. In such cases, as discussed earlier, letters recommending favorable court action on their cases were forwarded to the court for consideration at their eventual hearings.

B. Recidivism

From the point of view of improving the criminal justice system, a pre-trial diversion program which does not also reduce recidivism is of little value, its only

accomplishment a temporary alleviation of court workloads. One of the major premises of Project Crossroads has been that pre-trial manpower services and diversion from court adjudication would not only improve the labor market performance of its participants, but would also reduce the incidence of future criminal activity among them.

As part of the research evaluation of Project Crossroads conducted during Phase II, the first 200 adult participants enrolled in the project were followed up in court and police department records for a 15-month period following the date of their project enrollment to obtain recidivism data covering not only their participation period but at least a 12-month period after project termination. A control group of General Sessions Court defendants matched on major characteristics (age, race, sex, offense category, first offender status, pre-trial release on personal cognizance) with the participant group, but processed routinely by the court, was also followed up for a 15-month period in official records to obtain comparative recidivism data against which to gauge the effectiveness, if any, of Project Crossroads in reducing recidivism.

When the 15-month recidivism rates of both groups are compared, that of the favorably terminated Crossroads participants is less than half that of the control group as a whole (22.2% versus 45.7%) and still only half that of those controls whose charges were dropped or dismissed in the course of normal court processing (44%). Overall, recidivism among project participants is a third lower than among controls (31.4% versus 45.7%) as shown in the chart below.

RECIDIVISM OVER 15-MONTHS
FOLLOWING INITIAL COURT CONTACT*

GROUP	TOTAL NUMBER**	NUMBER OF RECIDIVISTS	PERCENT RECIDIVISTS
Participants	191	60	31.4%
- Favorable (charge dismissed)	140	31	22.2%
- Unfavorable	51	29	56.8%
Controls	105	48	45.7%
- Charges Dismissed	50	22	44%
- Other Disposition	55	26	47.3%

*Arrests recorded by Metropolitan Police Department, District of Columbia.

**Not included are 9 participants and 2 controls whose names could not be located in Police Department files.

In addition to showing that Project Crossroads was effective in deterring reversion to criminal activity on the part of its "successful" participants, the comparative recidivism data presented above has one implication of particular importance: the much lower recidivism rate among favorably terminated project participants than among controls whose charges were dismissed (virtually all in the pre-trial period) strongly implies that diversion from prosecution and trial, but without supportive and rehabilitative services, will not appreciably proscribe future criminal activity on the part of defendants so treated. This implication is reinforced by the closeness of recidivism rates between controls whose charges were dismissed and those who were tried and convicted (44% and 47.3%, respectively).

The implications and socio-economic effects of the reduction in recidivism attributable to Project Crossroads are treated in research summaries included in this report.

VIII. SUMMARY OF ANALYTICAL REPORTS

The previous sections of this report reviewed the Crossroads program in terms of its development, accomplishments, and problems--its E & D perspective. This chapter presents the summary results of measurement and cost-benefit analysis of the program.* Happily, the results of these studies reflect favorably on the project staff's achievements, despite their being based on the earliest group of participants. This was a source of considerable satisfaction to a dedicated staff who had worked extremely hard to make the program a success in personal terms with each of the young men and women enrolled. For the analysis to have indicated that the project had little or no effect on recidivism and employment patterns of participants compared to a control group, or that the project was economically unsound in terms of benefit-cost ratios, would have been disappointing. There would have been little comfort, if any, for the staff to have accomplished the E & D objectives of the project irrespective of the research results.

We were fortunate in obtaining the services of two extremely competent researchers: Mrs. Roberta Rovner-Pieczenik and Mr. John F. Holahan. They performed their respective tasks with integrity, conscientiousness and dispatch under difficult conditions. The complete texts of their studies are published separately to permit thorough review and analysis.

The summaries in this present report are included in order to provide a complete overview of the total effort

A. Measurement of Program Impact**

This study assesses the short- and long-term impact of a 90-day community-based program of manpower services--counseling, job placement, job training and remedial education--on youthful first-time offenders in the juvenile and adult courts of Washington, D.C. Project participants were between the ages of 16 and 26 and were charged with a misdemeanor offense. Among other findings, a control group comparison revealed a decrease in recidivism and an increase in employment (both findings of statistical significance) over a 15-month period following project termination. The impact of the program on differing populations is discussed in terms of future program planning.

Introduction

In 1967 few alternatives to court action were available in Washington, D.C., for the adjudication of criminally accused individuals. Between 1967 and 1970 Project Crossroads experimented with and demonstrated the feasibility of a pre-trial intervention alternative for youthful first-time offenders. Working with both the Juvenile Court and the Court of General Sessions, the study assessed the short- and long-term impact of a 90-day community-based program of manpower services--including counseling, job placement, job training, and remedial education--to young men and women in the pre-trial stage of the criminal court process. The courts, for their part, agreed to consider a "nol pros" of the charges pending against any project participant who terminated the project with a favorable recommendation. The opportunity to mitigate the negative by-products of present-day routine case processing and replace them with a relevant program for diversion and rehabilitation was deemed advantageous to the court, the defendant, and the community-at-large.

The present paper explores the following questions:

---

*The research design is reproduced in Appendix E.

**By Roberta Rovner-Pieczenik, Sociologist-Consultant; Ph.D. candidate, New York University; Coordinator of Law Forums, 1970 White House Conference on Children.

1. What impact has Project Crossroads made on the participants in the spheres of employment and recidivism?

2. What are the characteristics of participants who achieved success through the project?

Indicants of success were taken to be both short- and long-range. Short-range project success was indicated by the number of favorable recommendations (which meant relatively steady employment and/or schooling, and no rearrests) and the number of "nol prosses" of the charges pending. Long-range successes were taken to be non-recidivism and stable employment over a 12-month period following termination from Crossroads.

A profile of adult project participants revealed that a large majority had the following characteristics: male, black, below 20 years of age, born in Washington, high school dropout, living in a broken home, unemployed and out of school, non-self supporting. Previous studies have shown these variables to be related to continued unemployment and recidivism.

METHODOLOGY

The assessment offered in this paper is based on information taken from a systematic sampling of closed participant files: 157 adults and 123 juveniles. Follow-up interviews of these participants were conducted at approximately three-month intervals for one year after project termination. Information on rearrest was checked through the files of the Washington, D.C., Metropolitan Police Department and the Research Division of the Juvenile Court. A control sample of adult and juvenile offenders was selected as a yardstick against which findings for project participants could be compared. This entailed a systematic sampling of court records of individuals eligible for project entrance between one and six months prior to project commencement. The assessment of the data which follows focuses on quantitative data available in selected areas of program operation, and highlights implications for future program efforts. The analysis of the juvenile data is limited to an assessment of recidivism.

PROJECT IMPACT ON EMPLOYMENT

Quantitative employment data revealed short-term gains of adult participants; unemployment decreased approximately 30% between project entrance and termination. Perhaps the more significant comparison is that between intake and termination for only favorably terminated participants. Here we find employment at termination (87%) to be twice as large as employment at intake (44%). The proportion of participants receiving wages over $2.26 per hour multiplied 500 percent for this favorably terminated group. On the other hand, the skill level for Favorables and Unfavorables remained relatively similar. Thus, the project appears to have had a substantial short-range effect on employment and wages, but little on skills. We speculate that the employment service avoided placing participants in lower paying positions and made referrals to those higher paying jobs, without concomitant skill changes.

Perhaps the most dramatic contrast is in long-range goals: the comparison of steady employment one year prior to and one year after termination from Crossroads. Table 1 reveals that one year after project termination, over 50% of the participant sample had been employed for at least four-fifths of the year. This is to be compared to only 30% having been employed the year prior to project entrance (a statistically significant difference).

TABLE 1. COMPARISON OF ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE OF YEAR EMPLOYED PREVIOUS TO PROJECT CROSSROADS ENTRANCE AND PERCENTAGE OF YEAR EMPLOYED ONE YEAR FOLLOWING TERMINATION

PERCENT OF YEAR EMPLOYED*	ONE YEAR PRIOR TO PROJECT CROSSROADS Time of Intake		ONE YEAR AFTER TERMINATION Total**		Favorable**		Unfavorable	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
0- 19	31	23.14	41	30.61	24	23.09	17	56.68
20- 39	29	21.65	9	6.73	6	5.78	3	10.00
40- 59	19	14.19	5	3.74	3	2.90	2	6.68
60- 79	14	10.46	10	7.47	9	8.66	1	3.34
80- 89	6	4.48	12	8.96	10	9.62	2	6.68
90-100	35	26.12	57	42.54	52	50.00	5	16.67
TOTAL	134		134		104		30	

*Full- and Part-time.

**Significant at .01 level (chi-square).

When we look more closely at those favorably terminated, the percent employed after termination increases to 60%. After ruling out increased age and education as possible explanatory variables, we concluded that increases in percent of time employed following Crossroads termination are related to services provided by the project.

PROJECT IMPACT ON RECIDIVISM

In addition to channeling an accused offender into stable employment and increased wages, Project Crossroads also had a positive impact on the legal status of participants. Statistics reveal that 99% of the favorably terminated adults were "nol prossed" by the court (compared to 33% for the control sample). Even for those unfavorably terminated, the "nol pros," dismissal and acquital rate was 50%.

The most significant finding (socially and statistically) is that concerning recidivism. According to Table 2, overall recidivism (defined in this study as "rearrest") for adult Favorables was 20%, while for Unfavorables and Controls it was over twice as high. When we combine all project participants, we still find a difference of 14% between participants and controls who recidivated within 15 months after initial arrest.

TABLE 2. COMPARISON OF PARTICIPANT UNIVERSE AND CONTROL SAMPLE RECIDIVISM WITHIN 15 MONTHS OF INITIAL ARREST*

SAMPLES	TOTAL SAMPLE**		RECIDIVISM*	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Participants				
Total	200	100.00	59	29.50
Favorable	149	74.50	30	20.13
Unfavorable	51	25.50	29	56.65
Controls	107	100.00	46	43.36

*Data obtained from Metropolitan Police Records.

**Significant at the .05 level (chi-square).

Unfavorably terminated participants mirror the Controls in terms of adjudication of charge, time of rearrest and percent of recidivism. Rearrest statistics showed a slight progression to more serious crimes.

Juvenile statistics revealed that project participants showed no decrease in recidivism, as compared to the Controls. Yet, it is interesting that those participants who were rearrested within 15 months after project termination were more likely to have had a previous juvenile arrest record (61% with a previous record recidivated, compared with 28% without a previous record). For both first offenders and those with an arrest record, about 50% of all recidivism occurs within three months after arrest. While Crossroads appears to have no effect upon juvenile recidivism, anything short of an effort specifically oriented toward this age group appears to guarantee a continued pattern of failure.

SUCCESSFUL PARTICIPANTS

Of the adult sample, 78% performed satisfactorily in the project, were terminated favorably and were recommended for favorable court action on their pending charge. Almost all adult participants employed at project intake received a favorable termination (90% of those employed). A large percentage of these successes had been relatively steadily employed during the year prior to Crossroads enrollment (i.e., almost half were employed for more than 60% of the year), were working in skilled or semi-skilled positions (40%) and earning over $2.25 per hour (32%). Personal variables for those favorably terminated included being married and over age 20. Although the racial and sex variables (i.e., white and male) appear related to favorable termination, close scrutiny revealed that the relationship was really the result of a cluster of background variables which are sex and race-linked (e.g., age, education attainment, employment history). Those individuals who were most likely to be unfavorably terminated, in addition to having had a work history of unsteady employment, poor skills and low wages prior to project intake, also had an educational history of failure (no high school diploma).

Indicants of participant recidivism parallel the above findings. A particularly interesting statistic is one on education: high school graduates and those enrolled in college have a substantially lower recidivism rate (11% and 23%, respectively) than high school dropouts (42%).

IMPLICATIONS OF PROJECT FINDINGS

There is little doubt that Project Crossroads has succeeded in deterring recidivism and stabilizing employment for the large majority of its participants. But assessment of the quantitative data leads us to believe that the differential needs of participants, and the differential backgrounds they bring to the project, must be met through differential services.

Employment Approach - The data indicates that an employment-oriented project, such as Crossroads, is most suited for a relatively stable, older population. On the basis of our findings it is suggested that this program be extended to first offenders ranging beyond the 26-year-old group, age being a variable which should help a person into the project as opposed to screening him out. The first offender status might be retained in order to screen out "career" offenders. Incentives to complete job training programs and to maintain employment seem warranted. Staff counseling might be employment oriented and scheduled at staff-participant discretion.

Counseling Approach - The data indicates that Project Crossroads had a lesser impact on those who entered the project with a poor work and school history. This is usually correlated with younger age. The researcher interprets this data as indicating that this group is not yet "ready" for a program oriented towards steady, long-term employment. (This includes the juvenile sample.) It is felt that this group might be in need of an extensive and intensive counseling program (individual and group), remedial training (GED preparation) and/or job training. For some participants, time is needed for "growing up" to the demands of legitimate society. For others, an alternative is needed to the schools and community within which they have previously experienced failure. Whatever the need, the counseling approach would give this participant the time and supportive services necessary to work through personal and family problems, as well as those related to employment and the pressures of a "real" job.

This approach might also consider the availability of a staffed residential treatment facility which would enable a participant to leave his home and neighborhood for a limited period of time.

Other Recommendations - While little has been said in this paper about the work of the counseling division, this only reflects (1) a dearth of quantitative material, (2) limited researcher involvement with day-to-day staff activities, and (3) an inability to isolate counseling from other project activities. Yet, answers to an anonymous participant program evaluation form leads us to believe that the "new careers" person in a counseling position plays a critically important role in the project and should be continued.

To achieve maximum cooperation of this staff in any assessment endeavor, the initial role-orientation and training of this staff--as part of their understanding of program goals--is crucial to continued cooperation. In addition, if a systematic, controlled, empirical assessment of a project's impact and effectiveness is desired, the analysis component should be an integral part of the project, from planning to conclusion.

CONCLUSION

Project Crossroads has been shown to be successful in achieving its goals (to a statistically significant degree) of deterring recidivism and stabilizing employment for the larger proportion of its participants. Its success would be misunderstood and misplaced if it became a pre-packaged approach to delinquency and crime prevention. To maximize success in future projects, the data examined in the body of this paper suggest the tailoring of future projects to the differing needs of its would-be participants.

B. Benefit-Cost Analysis*

This chapter presents a summary of the results of a benefit-cost analysis of Project Crossroads. The program was designed as an alternative to the traditional judicial and correctional systems for individuals with no previous adult (18 years or over) convictions. Four hundred and sixty adult individuals participated in the program between September 1968 and April 1970. Through intensive counseling, job placement, remedial education and other services--over a three month period, following arrest but prior to trial--the program attempted to alter behavior patterns before individuals became accustomed to crime as a way of life. If, at the end of the 90-day period, the defendant had shown satisfactory progress, the court would, upon Crossroads' recommendation, dismiss the charges.

The program focused on youths arrested for a property crime and facing the probability of their first criminal conviction, and for whom there was a high probability of recidivism. While the crimes are non-violent, lesser offenses, it is believed that most serious offenders begin in this manner, get involved in the court and prison system, obtain a criminal record, and have a very difficult time "going straight."**

It is not assumed that the program, through counseling, remedial education, and placement services, will totally eliminate the urban crime problem. There is undoubtedly a significant population of individuals who are not likely to be "reformed" by manpower or other types of programs, or by the general amelioration of social and economic conditions. On the other hand, it is assumed here that there exists a sizeable population whose perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative life styles can be altered by this type of program. The hypothesis of this analysis is that the program will yield returns in terms of (a) an immediate reduction in costs to the criminal justice system through successful diversion of cases to the program, (b) increased productivity as reflected in higher wages and more regular employment, and (c) a reduction in future social costs from crime by lowering recidivism (rearrest) rates.

One of the most difficult problems encountered in program evaluations of this type is ascertaining what would have happened to program participants in the absence of the program. Estimates of the effects of programs are frequently made by comparison of program participants with a control group. Ideally, the two groups are matched for several sociodemographic characteristics and are selected simultaneously or from the same time period as the experimental group. It is rarely possible, however, to perfectly match the two groups.

In this study, the control group was selected randomly from court records from the 6-month period prior to the beginning of Crossroads operations in September 1968. Individuals were selected on the basis of their similarity to the participant group on the four major enrollment criteria: age, no prior adult convictions, offense category, and eligibility for personal bond. There were three factors which were impossible to control, and thus may be sources of bias: (1) project participants have to agree to enter the program, (2) permission to enroll must be given by the U.S. Attorney's Office, and (3) participants are interviewed by a project counselor before enrollment.

Selection of the control group from an earlier point in time than the participant group presented no serious problem for measuring the diversion and reduced recidivism benefits of the program. Information on case dispositions and incidence of rearrests for both groups was available from police and court records. However, the time difference did present serious problems for the measurement of the employment and earnings benefit, primarily because individuals were extremely difficult to contact. Thus, it became

*John F. Holahan, Economist-Consultant; Ph.D. Candidate, Georgetown University; Research Associate, D.C. Department of Corrections.

**President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force on Assessment of Crime, Crime and Its Impact, an Assessment (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office, 1967) pp. 79-80.

necessary to use the employment records of Crossroads participants prior to project enrollment as an indicator of their performance after the program. Adjustments were made to this data for inflation and increased age, both of which would normally cause earnings to be higher one year later even in the absence of a Crossroads program.

The benefits from the program were principally reductions in the amount of crime and its attendant social costs. The project works with individuals involved in property crimes, which are basically involuntary transfers of wealth. A theft of goods or cash is not an economic loss to society but, rather, constitutes a redistribution of ownership of wealth or monetary claims on wealth. Although there is a loss to the victim, there is no net reduction in social welfare, ignoring physical injury, property damage, etc., if that loss is equal to the gain of the perpetrator or ultimate consumer. Thus, while a program which reduces crime will yield benefits to potential victims, these are not properly considered social benefits.

While the value of property stolen should not be considered a loss to society as a whole, this does not mean that forced transfers of wealth have no social costs. Rather, they include the foregone productivity of the thief, assuming this would be in socially acceptable employment. The social costs also include the private and public resources which are expended to prevent crime and to adjudicate, punish, and rehabilitate criminals. This would include private expenditures on locks, alarms, lights, security guards, insurance, etc., and public expenditures on police, courts, and correctional systems. These expenditures employ human and material resources which could be employed elsewhere in the absence of crime. To the extent that these resources could be used productively elsewhere, they are a cost to society in their present use. Finally, one must also include the fear, avoidance of normal activity, community disruption, and so forth, which though impossible to qualify, are nonetheless very real costs of crime.

It is not possible to measure many of these costs of crime, and thus the estimates of the benefits from the program are understated. Estimates were made of the value of property stolen per crime and of the costs of police, courts, corrections, probation, and parole services. These were developed on a per-crime or per-offender, rather than total cost, basis. They were then used in measuring the resource savings or benefit from successful diversion of the cases from the courts and from reduction in recidivism rates.

The three principal, measurable social benefits derived from Project Crossroads were: the diversion benefit, the recidivism reduction benefit, and the earnings benefit. The diversion benefit was defined as the immediate return to society from enrollment of defendants in the program. Participants who were favorably terminated from the project had their cases dismissed in court. The value to society from diverting cases from the criminal justice system depends on the number of cases that otherwise would not have been diverted, the expected cost of adjudication, and the expected costs of sentence. The expected cost of adjudication depended on the costs of each type of judicial proceeding weighted by the probability that that type of trial would have been chosen. The expected costs of sentence depended on the costs of different types of dispositions, including acquittal, prison, etc., weighted by the probability that each disposition would have occurred.

The results of the analysis showed that 85.7% of Crossroads participants had their cases dismissed at termination, as opposed to 40.7% of the control group; 25.8% of the control group received probation sentences, as opposed to about 5% of the program participants; and 11.2% of the control group received prison sentences, while only 2.6% of the Crossroads group were sentenced to prison. The expected cost of judicial proceedings was applied to the project differences in number of persons receiving pleas, court trials and jury trials. The expected costs of sentences were applied to the projected differences in the number of persons receiving prison and probation sentences of different lengths.

The estimated value of judicial resource savings attributable to Project Crossroads, calculated with the above data and the estimates of costs of judicial proceedings and sentences, is presented in Table I.

TABLE I

REDUCED JUDICIAL AND CORRECTIONAL COSTS FROM DIVERSION OF CASES TO PROGRAM	
Pleas	$ 7,060.05
Non-Jury Trials	7,348.12
Jury Trials	19,440.00
Probation	10,369.44
Prison	71,276.64
	$115,494.25

Crossroads has provided a second benefit if it has in fact reduced recidivism. Most studies of recidivism show remarkably high rates, indicating that the traditional judicial and correctional processes are not particularly effective in rehabilitating offenders. A recent FBI survey of offenders released in 1968 found that 60% to 75% were rearrested within five years.* While these rates vary with age, the crime, the disposition, individual court sentencing policies, and the community to which released, the fact remains that recidivism is a major factor in rising crime rates. If the recidivism rate of Crossroads participants, during enrollment and after leaving the project, is lower than it would have been had they not participated in the project, it can be said that society has benefited.

In order to quantitatively measure this benefit, it was necessary to know something of the value to society from reducing recidivism rates by a given percentage. This required use of the estimates on the costs of different crimes, police services, various types of judicial proceedings and various types of sentences. Furthermore, it was necessary to construct a flow model to predict the probability of each judicial event and each type of disposition for each crime. With this information we could calculate the expected costs of recidivism and thus the benefit from the program to the extent that it reduces recidivism. The expected cost of recidivism is an average of the cost of each possible type of judicial proceeding and sentence weighted by the probability of the event occurring. For example, the estimate of the cost of recidivism, given the crime of robbery, includes the probability of release before trial and the attendant cost, the probability of jury trial and lengthy prison term and their attendant costs, etc. The probability of further rearrests and their expected costs are also included.

The flow model was calculated for four crimes, robbery, burglary, larceny, and auto theft. It was assumed when work began on this model that Crossroads and control group recidivists would commit one of these four property crimes. The results showed that 71% and 69% of the Crossroads and control group recidivists, respectively, did so. The results provided in Table IV provide the expected benefit, by crime of preventing the recidivism of one individual who, had he recidivated, would have committed robbery, burglary, larceny, or auto theft. These estimates can then easily be applied to a program reducing recidivism by 20, 50, 100, etc., individuals by simple multiplication. The estimate of the recidivism benefit, by crime, is provided below.

TABLE IV

Robbery	$9,582.07
Burglary	7,285.35
Larceny	5,992.96
Auto Theft	7,245.76

*Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reports, 1968, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 37.

The data from the Crossroads and control samples was then applied to the estimates provided by the model. Investigation of police department records was conducted by the Metropolitan Police Department to determine the incidence of recidivism in the two samples. The overall recidivism rate for the Crossroads and control groups were 26% and 36.4%, respectively. These recidivism rates do not include rearrests outside the District of Columbia jurisdiction. While extrajurisdictional offenses could result in higher recidivism rates, there is no reason to believe that the differential between the two groups would be altered. The differences between the two recidivism rates, 26% and 36.4% is not quite significant at the .05 level. The test for the significance of the difference between the two sample percentages yields a T-value of 1.86.

The estimated present value of the recidivism reduction benefit at three alternative interest rates, is provided in Table V.

TABLE V

PRESENT VALUE OF REDUCED RECIDIVISM	
5%	$216,963.00
10%	198,448.00
15%	182,634.00

A third quantifiable benefit derived from the project is that from increased earnings of participants. The true social benefit is the increase in each individual's material contribution to social welfare. It is assumed that earnings are a valid measure of an individual's productivity and that this, in turn, is a reflection of his contribution to social welfare.

The project employment staff developed and maintained contacts with area employers, both public and private, training programs, and with the public employment service. The benefits derived from providing job information and placement assistance to participants, thereby reducing the number and length of unsuccessful job searches and thus increasing earnings over a given period of time. The counseling of participants may have served to increase motivation, resulting in fewer job changes and shorter periods between jobs. If individuals were placed in training programs or in employment providing on-the-job training, skills and productivity may have increased, providing still further benefit.

Furthermore, if the overall effect of a program is to reduce recidivism, it is likely that employment rates will be higher, both in the present and the future. Reductions in time spent in prison increase the non-institutional population from which the labor force is drawn. Reduction in time spent pursuing a criminal career while out of prison will most likely be associated with higher labor force participation rates and lower unemployment rates.

There is no way of discerning if the effect of the program was one of a reduction in overall unemployment or of displacement of other workers. If, in fact, the gains to participants reduced the opportunities for others, use of earnings data overstates the net social benefit from the program. On the other hand, many participants would have had the burden of a conviction record, had the program not existed. Earnings for these participants would have been lower the year after the program than assumed here.

It is difficult to determine if there was any long term effect of job placement and counseling services. If there was no change in the skills or productivity of the participants, they will, after a given period of time, be in the same position in the labor market as they otherwise would have been. On the other hand, if increased motivation and productivity have occurred, participants will be in a superior position in the labor market than otherwise long after termination from the project. In this study we make the possibly conservative assumption that there is no effect beyond one year. Earnings beyond one year

are assumed to be the same as they would have been in the absence of the program, except for the adjustment of higher employment rates due to reduced recidivism. It was estimated on the basis of available data that the 10.4% difference in recidivism was associated with a 2.6% difference in the level of employment. This is the same, conceptually, as reducing the cost of crime; the cost, in this case is the foregone earnings of criminal offenders.

It was estimated that earnings of the 460 participants were $45,854 greater during the counseling period than they would have been, and $102.577 greater the year following termination from the program. The estimated total differential in earnings, projected over 5 years to include the gain due to reduced recidivism, was $225,869.

The benefit-cost ratio is an investment criteria which states that decision makers should invest in those projects for which the ratio of the present value of benefits to the present value of costs is greater than unity. The total benefit from the program is the sum of the present values of each benefit. The diversion benefit accrued in year zero for foregone court proceedings and over the first year or two for foregone sentences. The other benefits (earnings, reduced recidivism) could be expected to accrue over several years. All costs were incurred in year zero. Future benefits were discounted because income or benefits to be received in the future do not have the same value as the same benefits or income received in the present. In this study benefits were discounted at interest rates of 5%, 10%, and 15%. Benefit-cost ratios at each rate of discount are presented in Table VI.

TABLE VI

PRESENT VALUE OF SOCIAL BENEFITS FROM PROJECT CROSSROADS

	5%	10%	15%
Diversion	$109,995.00	$104,995.00	$100,430.00
Earnings	190,282.00	170,729.00	156,074.00
Recidivism	216,964.00	198,448.00	182,634.00
Total Benefit	$517,240.00	$474,172.00	$439,138.00
Total Cost	$233,256.00	$233,256.00	$233,256.00
Benefit Cost Ratios	2.2	2.0	1.8

An investment which has a benefit-cost ratio exceeding unity can be considered a socially worthwhile or "profitable" expenditure. The use of alternative discount rates here indicates that the benefit-cost ratio is not sensitive to changes in the rate. Thus, the benefit-cost ratios presented above indicate that the Crossroads program has been an efficient use of society's resources.

Many of the benefits from the program were not estimated. The value of the remedial education program was not measured. The benefit estimates do not include private expenditures for crime prevention equipment and manpower, or the extent of migration, avoidance of normal activity, use of less efficient means of transportation, and community disruption which may be foregone with reduction in recidivism. Omission of these factors may result in seriously underestimating the benefits from this type of program. On the other hand, the measurement of the program's value depends on the ability to successfully control for the performance of participants in the absence of the program. The difficulties in developing control groups for accurate measurement of the earnings and recidivism benefits were discussed above.

The effectiveness of a program such as Project Crossroads cannot be analyzed without consideration of the staff which administered it or the general social and economic environment in which it is adopted. It is important to remember that this is not merely an analysis of the economic feasibility of an alternative to the normal judicial and correctional processes, but a measurement of the effect of a program at a certain point in time, in a unique locale, and with a specific staff. Whether such a project is a worthwhile innovation depends not only on its conceptual validity but also on these other factors. Such a program adopted during a recession, in a depressed area, or with inadequate personnel would not meet with as much success as one adopted under more favorable conditions. To more thoroughly test the value of the innovation, the Crossroads concept should be introduced into other cities with different economic and social conditions, and conducted with different personnel.

These results suggest that alternative approaches to the traditional judicial and correctional processes can be effective. However, this does not mean that this type of program is better than other alternatives to the status quo. Other policies or programs which offer alternatives to the existing structure may have benefit-cost ratios which exceed those found here and under certain budgetary constraints should be adopted rather than this program.

There is also no evidence that this program is the best possible pre-trial diversion program. Some alternative mix of counseling, job placement, remedial education and other services over a longer time period may yield higher benefit-cost ratios.

IX. TRANSITION

Project Crossroads was an investigation, in an experimental and demonstration setting, of one alternative to the traditional processing of accused offenders to improve what Chief Justice Warren E. Burger calls the "social utility" of the criminal justice system. That is, its capacity to strike a fair balance between the needs of society and of the individual, which "is the keystone of any fair and decent system of justice." We believe we were successful in demonstrating a feasible and effective procedural alternative which permits redress of the social, educational, and economic deficiencies of the typical first-time youthful offender who enters the system, while at the same time avoiding the liabilities of conventional processing.

It is now generally accepted knowledge that offenders committed to a correctional institution often do not receive the kinds of services that are effective in helping them avoid repetition of criminal behavior. Life in jail or prison tends to embitter and harden individuals, particularly if their experience in confinement is non-productive. Incarceration seemingly does not bring about meaningful personality changes nor does it result in long-range benefits to society or the offender. But even if a convicted offender is not jailed but placed on probation, he is rarely provided the types of services and the individual attention that will preclude his subsequent reversion to criminal activity. Probation caseloads are unmanageable because of size and the ever increasing pressure of arrests caused by expanding police enforcement. In addition, the accused will have a criminal record which severely circumscribes his future employment prospects.

To maintain the orientation and services introduced into the local court system, NCCY aspired to an eventual transition of the project from an experimental pilot effort to a permanent pre-trial intervention program for youthful offenders in the District of Columbia. Throughout the first phase of operations, much thought was given to the several alternative means of effecting this institutionalization, and the respective advantages and disadvantages of each were debated extensively both in-house and with interested outsiders.

Most attractive on several points was the idea of creating a new agency--an incorporated Project Crossroads which would be independent of the court system and other government "bureaucracies." In addition to the independence and flexibility this course of action would assure, it had the added advantage of retaining a non-official and non-authoritarian image for the program--an important factor from the participants' point of view. The Manhattan Court Employment Program has taken this approach and is expanding its operations in the Manhattan and Brooklyn Courts.

Another alternative given serious consideration was the merger of the project with an existing agency working with legal offenders. Most obvious in this regard were the District of Columbia Legal Aid Agency and the D.C. Bail Agency (which itself evolved from a pilot program in the middle 1960's). Neither of these, however, seemed feasible upon closer examination; the addition of the Crossroads program appeared more likely to detract from rather than complement their primary functions.

The third alternative for institutionalizing the Crossroads program--and one which we believe has the most potential for a lasting impact on the quality of administration of justice in the District of Columbia--was that of incorporating the project into the court system itself. From the beginning of our involvement with the courts we were impressed with the quality and dedication of the judges and prosecutors with whom the project associated and their intent to improve the system. The decision was thus made to explore the possibility of absorption of Project Crossroads into the District of Columbia courts upon expiration of the contract period. This alternative seemed especially desirable in view of the fact that new legislation had provided for a complete administrative reorganization of the D.C. court system to take place in 1971.

Obtaining support for this proposal was greatly facilitated by the close working relationship which had been maintained between the project and both the judiciary and the prosecutor's office throughout the program, including the earliest stages of program planning. Both court divisions were kept abreast of the project's operations, knew its performance record, and were pleased with its results. Early in 1970 the project director received notification that the Board of Judges of the General Sessions Court and the Chief United States Attorney for the District of Columbia approved absorption of the project upon expiration of the Labor Department-funded experimental and demonstration period.

A request for appropriations to effect the transition was submitted for Congressional approval in conjunction with appropriations to implement the District of Columbia court reform under the provisions of the Uniform Crime Control Act of 1970. The Manpower Administration provided interim funding for the project beyond the original expiration date pending final Congressional action. The necessary appropriations were approved in the finalweeks of the 91st Congress, and the project staff was informed that the transition will be effective as of February 1, 1971.

The absorption of the project into the new Superior Court of D.C. is planned to include all the present staff except the director, assistant director and the manpower specialist. This is in keeping with the original intent of program administrators to provide upward mobility and career opportunities for the paraprofessional workers who contributed to the development and success of the program and to avoid duplication with the court structure. It is expected that in the future "Crossroads" will be much enlarged and serve a vastly expanded category of clients, as well as provide direct assistance to the Probation Department by offering placement services to probationers on an equal basis with program participants. There will also be other areas of interest in keeping with the need to make the program viable in serving this community.

APPENDIX

A. Expanded General Sessions Court Criteria

B. Expanded Juvenile Court Criteria

C. Correspondence Regarding Project's Transition to D.C. Superior Court

D. Letter of Intent Between Project and NYC

E. Research Design

F. Congressional Record Reprints

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH *WASHINGTON DC, 20001*

PROJECT CROSSROADS *527 - SIXTH STREET NW*
(202) 628-7885
(202) 783-8853

LEON G. LEIBERG
Project Director

M E M O R A N D U M

November 5, 1970

TO: Court of General Sessions Personnel and Defense Attorneys

FROM: Director, Project Crossroads

SUBJECT: Expansion of Eligibility Criteria

The United States Attorney's Office has recently approved expansion of Project Crossroads enrollment criteria to extend the opportunity for pre-trial diversion to a broader range of defendants. The modified criteria, which are effective immediately, are as follows:

1. SEX, AGE: Males and females between 16 and 40 years of age.

2. RESIDENCE: Washington, D. C., Metropolitan Area.

3. EMPLOYMENT STATUS: Unemployed, underemployed, or job in jeopardy because of arrest; for juveniles, tenuous school enrollment or school dropout.

4. CHARGES: Petit larceny, auto theft (attempted), receiving stolen property, false pretenses, forgery, soliciting for prostitution, burglary II, simple assault (involving a relative), unlawful entry, presence in illegal establishment, destroying property, procuring, pocketbook snatch where there is no injury to the victim, possession of amphetamines or barbiturates. Special cases referred by Assistant U. S. Attorneys and judges.

   NOTE: Drug addicts, chronic alcoholics, and defendants with serious psychological disorders are excluded.

5. PRE-TRIAL RELEASE STATUS: Must qualify for personal recognizance under the criteria of the District of Columbia Bail Agency.

6. PRIOR RECORD: First offenders and second offenders with reasonable lapse of time between previous conviction and current charge.

LGL/mmj

Memorandum of Understanding Between the
Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia and the
National Committee for Children and Youth-Project Crossroads

I. CRITERIA

The eligible group will consist of:

1. Juveniles, male or female, 16 years of age or older;

2. Who are not currently under the jurisdiction of the Court, nor awaiting a hearing on a prior delinquency charge;

3. Who have never been committed to a juvenile institution as a result of being adjudged involved in a delinquency offense;

4. Who have not been adjudged involved in a delinquency offense within one year prior to project referral; and

5. Who suffer neither from drug addiction nor severe personality disorders at the time of project referral

Youths who meet the above criteria may be referred to Crossroads for any of the following offenses:

Assault: Simple
Burglary II
Disorderly Conduct
False Pretenses
Petit Larceny
Prostitution
Receiving Stolen Goods
Taking Property Without Right
Tampering with Auto
Unauthorized Use of Auto (as a passenger)
Unlawful Entry

Under special circumstances, youths charged with the following offenses who otherwise meet the first five criteria may be referred to Crossroads at the discretion of the Intake Officer and with the approval of the Head of the Intake Division, or an officer designated by the head of the division for that purpose:

Aggravated Assault
Burglary I
Carrying Dangerous Weapon (not including gun)
Forgery
Grand Larceny
Property Damage
Purse Snatch
Robbery (Fear, Force and Violence)
Unauthorized Use of Auto (Driver)

II. REFERRALS

Referrals will be made by the Intake Division of the Juvenile Court. In the event that referrals are made to Crossroads from other sources (attorneys, friends, etc.) Crossroads will consult with the Intake Officer of the proposed participant as to his eligibility.

III. PROJECT SERVICES

1. Education: By providing individual remedial education and assistance to return to school, if out of school.

2. Employment: Full- or part-time remunerated employment at not less than minimum wage scale in occupations providing for the possibility of continuing responsibilities, training and increased income.

3. or Training: In both the public and private sector with primary focus on area manpower training programs, and in occupational areas of interest to the participant.

4. Housing and Family Needs: By making full use of Welfare and Health Department resources of the District of Columbia to insure that critical needs are being met.

5. Counseling: Using intensive short term individual and group counseling techniques to attempt to stabilize the individual in an effort to modify attitudes which will improve employability and deter from further anti-social behavior.

IV REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

1. Weekly Report - Crossroads will submit weekly to the Chief Judge, the Director of Social Services, and the Intake Division a report setting forth the names, ages, charges, and sources of referrals of all participants accepted into the project the previous week.

2. Program Letter - Within three weeks of the date of referral Crossroads will submit to the Intake Officer a letter outlining the focus of the program planned for the individual participant and acknowledging his official enrollment in the project.

3. Final Letter - At the end of project participation a final letter will be submitted describing the progress, activities, cooperation, and attitudes of the participant while in the project.

V. TERMINATION FROM THE PROJECT

A termination letter will be forwarded to the Court in the case of marked non-cooperation with the project or in the case of a new law violation, and the juvenile will then be subject to the usual Court procedures. Hearings for the juveniles who have responded favorably to the project will be scheduled before the Hearing Officer approximately three months from the date of referral to the project. An Assistant Corporation Counsel is to be given advance notice of all such hearings before the Hearing Officer. At the hearing the juvenile will be represented by an attorney. A Project Crossroads worker will also be present. The Hearing Officer may recommend to a judge that the petition be dismissed, or he may direct that the petition be heard before a judge who may close it without a finding, continue for disposition, or continue for disposition, or continue for trial.

Chief Judge, D.C. Juvenile Court

Director, Project Crossroads

DATE: September 26, 1969

The Washington Post

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER ...★ THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 1970 PAGE A18

The Damaging Image of Juvenile Court

The most recent report on Washington's Juvenile Court turns out to be more than the usual depressing account of case backlogs, inadequate facilities and outmoded operating procedures. It details the disturbing record of a system that seems to be promoting rather than helping to solve the problems of juvenile crime here. The two-year study, made by a team of judges and lawyers, concludes that the court's disorganization is so thorough that it thwarts the primary mission of any court: to deter offenders from further crime.

The case delays alone would be enough to shatter public respect. Many youths are not tried until two or three years after their alleged offenses —and may wait as long as a year before charges are formally lodged against them at initial hearings. Some spend months in the Receiving Home waiting for court hearings. Others "frequently tell social workers and others that their cases have been 'dropped' when in fact their cases are pending as part of the backlog," the team points out, adding that any deterrent effect from immediate apprehension and trial is lost to begin with. Beyond that, a youth's case is likely to be processed by two or three social workers, two or more attorneys and different judges — all contributing to the bafflement of the delinquent.

Even when the court orders an action, it may go unexecuted "because the individuals and agencies most involved with the court do not feel any sense of urgency or obligation." Often there aren't even reliable statistics or reports upon which to base decisions. Rehabilitation efforts—supposedly the key to real success in the juvenile delinquency field—have occupied only about 5 per cent of the court's time. The panel also found that judges and defense lawyers have in some instances agreed to place a delinquent on probation if he admitted involvement and dropped his demand for a jury trial.

These problems also infect our system for handling adult suspects and it is understandable that many of them have no respect for the courts. But to expect any comprehension of crime, punishment or rehabilitation on the part of errant youths in such a setting is literally against the odds. Furthermore, the report stresses that "streamlining present procedures will not be enough," that "piecemeal improvements will not do the job."

Acting Chief Judge Orman W. Ketcham, who has headed the court since the death of Chief Judge Morris Miller in May, says he is concentrating on "doing what is feasible in the short run" to effect some reforms recommended by the task force report. Now, at least, the court's judges are meeting on a regular basis to discuss problems; efforts are under way to slim down the calendar; and Judge Ketcham has met with the police and marshals to promote more cooperation.

The more basic changes are before Congress, as part of the protracted conference committee negotiations over District of Columbia crime legislation. Under President Nixon's reorganization plan, the Juvenile Court would become a branch of a new Superior Court, thus able to benefit from the machinery and manpower of a better organized system. That this important proposal is embroiled in the debate over other controversial anticrime provisions is simply another chapter in this saga of delay.

53 €1

COPY

December 3, 1969

TO: Chief Judge Greene

FROM: Judge Belson

RE: Project Crossroads

Project Crossroads has been in operation in the Court of General Sessions since September of 1968. It has been supplied by the Manpower Administration of the U.S Department of Labor with funds which will be exhausted on September 15, 1970. I am informed that as of September 1969 230 defendants in this Court had been enrolled in the project, 70 percent of whom had their charges nolle prossed after a 90-day period of cooperation with the project. Their recidivism rate was extremely successful in its efforts to rehabilitate youthful offenders, I recommend that Project Crossroads be incorporated into the Probation Department of this Court effective not later than September 1970.

The proposed inclusion of Crossroads in the Probation Department has been the subject of several meetings in recent weeks attended by the Project Director, Mr. Leon Leiberg, Harry Greene, Esq., who has served as the project's liaison with the U.S. Attorney's Office, John B. Bindl, Director of Probation, Mr. Burton, the Clerk of the Court, Mr. Berling, Administrative Officer, and the undersigned. In his attached memorandum of September 30, 1969, Mr. Leiberg explains the manner in which Crossroads would be included in our probation Department as a separate department or unit thereof. Of vital concern is the matter of funding. Mr. Leiberg's memorandum sets forth at page 5 an annual budget in the amount of $186.858.20. With the help of Mr. Greene and Mr. Burton a slightly more precise budget has evolved. It is set forth in Attachment A to the instant memorandum. As modified, the projection of the total cost for a full year's operation would be $190,094.88. Attachment A hereto replaces the budget set forth at page 5 of Mr. Leiberg's memorandum.

Also attached hereto is the memorandum of John B. Bindl dated October 1, 1969, which expressed his endorsement of the proposed inclusion of Crossroads in the Probation Department.

Following the circulation of the memorandum of September 30th and October 1st, further meetings were held among the persons mentioned above. It was concluded that no significant problems would be created by the proposed incorporation of Project Crossroads, but to the contrary substantial advantages to the Court and to those who come before it would be derived from the inclusion.

I feel I should mention also a few potential problems which I believe our meetings resolved. The question whether the Court can use the services of volunteers was discussed. It was concluded on the basis of two legal memoranda prepared by the Attorney Advisors Office that the use of volunteer probation officers is not barred by law. Project Crossroads has in the past used persons who were not paid for their services. It was agreed by all concerned that such persons can properly be utilized as voluntary probation officers or deputy probation officers. Crossroads would endeavor to continue to use of VISTA volunteers, but since they are paid by the Federal Government, they are not truly volunteers.

Mr. Burton raised the question of tort claims, for example, those which might be brought by persons struck by the automobiles of Project Crossroads field workers. It was

agreed that the Crossroads personnel would be required to obtain insurance for their vehicles just as, I understand, probation officers are at the present time. I add that, if possible, they should be required to secure policies which do not exclude the District Government as an additional insured. Otherwise, the policies will be of no use in the type of situation Mr. Burton discussed.

The request by Mr. Leiberg at page 5 of his memorandum that the National Council on Children and Youth be permitted to monitor the program after it is administered by the Court should raise no problems. It would be understood that the NCCY would not have access to any confidential files or materials in the Probation Department, but its representatives would be welcome to speak with probation officers, enrollees, and other interested persons; and the Probation Department would be willing to make available to NCCY any nonconfidential reports or statistics which it prepares.

It should be noted that in its program Project Crossroads has successfully employed the services of some persons with criminal records. It is apparent that carefully selected persons in that category should be able to make a peculiarly valuable contribution. It was agreed that such persons should remain in the program and that if there is any difficulty with respect to hiring them as court employees, as such, they be retained on a consulting basis. Moneys for that purpose are included in the budget.

Also of interest in connection with this proposal is the possibility of obtaining a Law Enforcemement Assistance grant of some $200,000 a year for two or more years for the purpose of funding a residential center which would house selected probationers and Crossroads enrollees for periods of two or three weeks. Mr. Bindl and Mr. Leiberg are pursuing the matter of this highly desirable grant, which is contingent on the inclusion of Crossroads. Its funding would be separate from the appropriations needed to finance Crossroads as a part of the Probation Department.

On the basis of the above discussed and the attached memoranda, I strongly recommend that Project Crossroads be included in the Probation Department. Since a supplemental appropriation will be required, time appears to be of the essence; and I therefore urge that the matter be taken up at a Board of Judges meeting in the relatively near future.

J.A.B.

Attachments

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
Fifth and F Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone 629-4342

PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Peter J. Slevin, Jr.
Assistant Director of Probation

John B. Bindl
Director of Probation

Thomas D. Tieff
Assistant Director of Probation

MEMORANDUM

October 1, 1969

TO: The Honorable James A. Belson, Judge

FROM: John B. Bindl, Director of Probation

REFERENCE: Endorsement of Attached Crossroads Proposal

As you know, we in the Probation Department of this Court have followed with keen interest the progress of Project Crossroads. We believe this service should be incorporated as a part of the Probation Department of this Court.

The memorandum to you from Mr. Leon Leiberg spells out in detail the timetable for transfer of Project Crossroads to our department to be added to the 1971 budget, earmarked for the Probation Department. We are not suggesting expansion of the service at this time because the Court merger has not been approved. The plan is sufficiently flexible to continue servicing both our criminal division and the juvenile section or, if need be, could be expanded into the criminal division.

You will note that space rental has not been included. If space will not be available within the Probation Department, we would need approximately $5,000 per year for rental of the presently occupied space. The office equipment would be transferred at no cost to the Court beyond regular maintenance.

We urge early approval of the proposal so that all the necessary planning can be arranged to assure orderly transfer of this service as part of the fiscal 1971 budget.

This service is very much in line with the recommendations made by the President's Crime Commission in developing differential services and rehabilitative action from the earliest possible time the defendant is in contact with the system of the administration of criminal justice.

JJB:bw

M E M O R A N D U M

September 30, 1969

TO: The Honorable James Belson
Associate Judge
Court of General Sessions

VIA: Mr. John B. Bindl
Director of Probation

FROM: Leon G. Leiberg
Director, Project Crossroads

REFERENCE: Absorbtion of Crossroads into the Superior Court of the District of Columbia

At the conclusion of the meeting held September 19, in your office, it was decided that a formal memorandum be prepared outlining procedures and establishing a budget for the transfer of NCCY Crossroads operations to the Court in fiscal 1971. The reason for planning one year ahead is simply stated, the fact that project monies will be exhausted on the 15th of September, 1970, the anticipated date of completion of the experimental and demonstration activities funded by the Manpower Administration of the United States Department of Labor.

A continuation of "Crossroads" will not be possible unless funds from other sources are made available, permitting a smooth and uninterrupted transfer of sponsorship and continued recruitment of youthful offenders.

Presently, under intake rules agreed upon with the U.S. Attorney's Office "we have enrolled during the last 13 months 1.6% of all defendants arraigned in General Sessions Court." Based on our success rate to date, 70% of project participants (1.1% of total number of defendants) are diverted from formal Court action and their charges nolle prossed. The recidivism rate of 4% among those nolled has held steadily, indicating substantial stability on the part of the individuals favorably terminated, and should pave the way for additional categories of offenders, such as repeaters and non-predatory felons, to receive the opportunity for similar diversion at a substantial savings in Court time and cost.*

Essentially, Crossroads provides for the element of community involvement and response to inner city residents' needs which has been absent in the formal Court procedures of the past, it establishes relevance by offering employment and human services at a critical time, and within a period of time (90 days) provides for complete release if the person involved has tangibly shown his interest to pursue legitimate goals.

STAFF

As presently constituted, the staff of Crossroads is composed of two administrative, three employment and eight counseling staff, in addition to two secretaries, which occupy two offices located at 527-6th Street, N.W. and 629 F Street, N.W. in close proximity to the Court.

*See Attachment.

VISTA workers (full-time service volunteers) have been part of the project since inception. Five volunteers are assigned by OEO to the project, their stipends paid directly by the Office of Economic Opportunity for their one year term of service. They have responsibility for the educational component of the project and recruit tutors and community volunteers independently but under supervision of paid staff. This manpower resource is extremely valuable and it is suggested that it be extended should Crossroads be absorbed by the Court.

This staff, both professional and non-professional, includes among the latter two former offenders who have made good contributions to the overall effort. They represent a new careers approach to the administration of justice, and by example provide credibility to project participants who attempt new life styles. This basic personnel structure with exclusion of administrative staff could form the nucleus of a rehabilitative pre-arraignment unit of the Probation Department. Overall supervision would be exercised by the Director of Probation, who would also closely monitor effectiveness and results. It is essential, however, to maintain a distinct separation of functions between probation and Crossroads staff. There is much at the same time that needs to be shared, particularly in relation to the community aspects of this effort and sensitivity to problems faced by inner city residents.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

A particularly important aspect of Crossroads is its effective employment component. The availability of such a service within the Probation Department is considered instrumental in stabilizing offenders who have committed economic types of crimes. Reliance on city employment programs is not adequate since vested interests and the difficulties inherent when working with an offender population shift priorities to individuals potentially less troublesome. The agencies concerned have clearly stated this position in the "Cooperative Manpower Planning System" (CAMPS) and do recommend a court controlled service, capable of close cooperation with local manpower services.

COST

The basic annual cost for a Crossroads-type Court service seems modest when measured with traditional alternatives such as incarceration or long-term formal probation and parole. At present, under experimental conditions, the rough cost per person serviced is in the neighborhood of $300. The return to the treasury in the form of taxes alone pays for the total expenditure, and savings in usual welfare payments to dependents should defendants be imprisoned vastly exceed this total.

As planned, the Crossroads-type diversion effort within the structure of the Probation Department could consist of the following:

STAFF

Nine community workers (new careers) at GS-7 ratings	$ 68,751.00
Five community workers (semi-professional) at GS-9 ratings	46,600.00
One supervisor at GS-12	13,389.00
Three secretaries at GS-5	18,528.00
Total Staff Cost	$147,168.00
15% Fringe Benefits	22,090.20
TOTAL	$169,358.20
Local Travel Reimbursable at Current Rates	2,500.00
Other Services including Consultants at Actual Cost not to exceed $75 per day	15,000.00
TOTAL	$186,858.20

All furniture, equipment, files, etc., at present used by Crossroads and the property of the U.S. Department of Labor, will be transferred "in toto" to the Court in the event the proposal is accepted. The responsibility of arranging this transfer with the Federal property officer will rest with NCCY.

If absorbtion of the program could occur at an early date, the cost would nevertheless be carried by NCCY Crossroads until the formal expiration of the contract on September 15, 1970.

It is hoped that NCCY will be permitted to monitor the operational aspect of the Court administered Crossroads program for the purpose of obtaining information which would assist other jurisdictions and the Manpower Administration.

DRAFT PROPOSAL COPY

Goal:

To provide the Probation Department, the Judiciary of the Court of General Sessions, and Project Crossroads with a residential facility open to first offenders and probationers whose economic adjustment is marginal and who are in need of a variety of short-term types of assistance until capable of assuming more responsibility for their everyday needs.

It is proposed that placement in the residential facility will come about in any of three ways: (1) By Project Crossroads in connection with its efforts with first offenders and in connection particularly with its job-training and employment services; (2) By the Court in cases of persons who have been convicted and who at the time of sentencing might be deemed unsuitable for probation unless this proposed alternative to incarceration were available as a part of the Court-directed probation program; and (3) By the Probation Department upon its own initiative in cases of persons already placed on probation by the Court who thereafter appear to be in need of the type of specialized short-term assistance which the residence will be able to supply.

Such a multiple focus will provide a new range of services to young offenders based on tangible adjustment in the community and resulting in fewer cases committed to institutions.

The approval and funding of this project will in no way impinge upon the independence of the probation staff in making recommendations or on the Judges of the Court in rendering their decisions. Also, the monitoring efforts by LEAA personnel will be conducted according to Court rules and procedures guaranteeing the confidential nature of official records.

Program Outline:

A program to insure that comprehensive assistance is provided to offenders after arrest which will avoid needless incarceration and provide the basis for their positive integration into the community by meaningful job training, employment, counseling and education.

There are presently available in the District of Columbia two structured alternatives to incarceration for the offender--an experimental pre-trial program, called Project Crossroads, which diverts successful participants from criminal prosecution, and the post-adjudication services of the Probation Department. At different points in the criminal justice process, both organizations attempt to provide supportive services and the opportunity for achieving social and economic stability to offenders through community-based programs. Both also recognize that their success in achieving these objectives would be considerably enhanced by the availability of a short-term group residence facility for their respective efforts.

Since the early months of 1968, the United States Department of Labor-sponsored "Project Crossroads" has been functioning in both the Juvenile and General Sessions Courts of the District of Columbia, aiming at diverting youthful first offenders from the Criminal Justice process. This project has received national attention as a result of its demonstrating that persons charged with economic types of offenses, are able to adjust positively to society with a markedly reduced incidence of recidivism. Locally, it has received the full cooperation of the Office of the U.S. Attorney and the Courts. It is presently proposed that the Crossroads Project be incorporated into the D.C. Court of General Sessions Probation Department after completing its experimental phase. That proposal is now under active consideration.

At a very early date in the project's operation, it became apparent that a number of individuals lacked even the most rudimentary basis for community stability because their living situation was completely disorganized. A review of community resources revealed that, with the exception of "mission" type overnight lodging sponsored by the Salvation Army, residential assistance of the type needed was not available locally. This hindered full utilization of the manpower services offered by Project Crossroads, and in some instances was the basis for a participant's negative termination from the project.

There is a similar need for such a resource among probationers. There are currently over 2,000 persons on probation under the supervision of the Probation Department at the D.C. Court of General Sessions. It has been evident for some time that within this group of probationers there are a significant number whose living conditions and whose economic and social adjustment, at a particular point in time, combine in such a way that successful functioning in the community is virtually impossible. The probationer lacks sufficient family ties or social contacts and is without support in the community. This crisis situation obviously requires immediate and effective solutions, other than mere incarceration.

A more realistic alternative to incarceration would be to have under the administrative supervision and control of the Probation Department a "probation hostel" where probationers could be housed on a short-term basis until suitable replanning can be accomplished. Whether this is resolved within a few days or a few weeks, the counseling and other services would be available through the Probation Department without disturbing the positive aspects of the relationship with the probation officer, so important at this critical time. The needs of the individual could be evaluated immediately and necessary steps taken toward resolving the crisis sufficiently to return the probationer to a situation more conducive to suitable living, as well as prepare him to take full advantage of it. Individual and group counseling, a full range of employment counseling and placement services, as well as other more direct assistance in developing suitable living quarters, etc., would be available seven days a week.

At a time of greater community concern as to the causes and problems of crime and the justified requests for humane treatment of offenders based on rehabilitation, it is essential that an attempt be made to investigate under clinical conditions the effectiveness of a fully non-penal community residence.

Continuous follow up of the participant's performance and adjustment will be made to determine the impact of the program and to modify the focus based on operational experience.

Operating Procedures:

Admission will be contingent upon referral by the Probation Department and Crossroads coordinated by the resident administrator and based on criteria to be established cooperatively.

Priority will be given to individuals who are without employment and visible means of support between the ages of 18-35,* or as determined by the Director of Probation who will have ultimate responsibility. Available space will be divided upon a substantially equal basis between Crossroads and probation referrals.

Within 24 hours after admission a complete assessment of the employment needs of the individual will have been made with the aim of achieving rapid economic self-

*Based on F.B.I. national statistics (Uniform Crime Reports-1968), 74% of the police arrests involve individuals 18 years of age. Within this group, 18-35 year olds account for 80% of the arrests for serious crimes against persons and property, 90% of all narcotics arrests, over 80% of arrests for stolen property offenses, and 70% of arrests on weapons charges.

sufficiency. At the same time, the person's other needs will be assessed, particularly with respect to his short-range emotional and social adjustment. Crisis intervention aimed at meeting these needs will be rendered immediately and will continue during the entire length of residence.

VISTA volunteers assigned to the hostel will provide educational and cultural enrichment assistance in the evening hours and on weekends. This intervention, by interested and specialized service volunteers, is aimed at overcoming feelings of rejection by the community.

VISTA volunteers have participated in Project Crossroads since inception of the program; their contribution has added depth and flexibility to staff capabilities. VISTA volunteers are able to offer and conduct evening programs and weekend activities for participants, are trained in community organization, and are often able to introduce innovative approaches to program operations. VISTA and other community volunteers are an important symbol of community concern for the problems of the young offender population.

Contacts with OEO/VISTA concerning the future deployment of service volunteers have been made and it is anticipated that they will continue to serve the offender population through the services offered by the Court.

Ex-offenders have also been involved in the Crossroads program as counselors and community workers, proving that this untapped manpower resource can also make a substantial contribution provided they are otherwise qualified.

Once the individual is provided with meaningful employment and involved with supportive services, his stay at the hostel should help stabilize his behavior and he will be better able to make long-range decisions on his own behalf. At this point, he will also contribute his fair share toward his upkeep in the hostel, reimbursing expenditures for food and room. It is anticipated that in most cases, within three weeks of arrival the resident should be able to maintain himself in the community and use only the non-residential based services made available to him.

BUDGET:

A. Staff Services

Administrator (GS-11)		$11,233.00
Clerk-typist (GS-5)		6,175.00
Counselor (GS-7)		7,639.00
Counselor, 1-1/2 time (GS-9)		13,975.00
Research Analyst (GS-10)		10,252.00
Janitor Housing Engineer (GS-5)		6,176.00
	SUB-TOTAL	$55,450.00
15% Fringe Benefits-Leave		8,318.00
	TOTAL	$63,768.00
Consulting Services at Cost not to Exceed $75 per day		2,500.00
TOTAL STAFF SERVICES		$66,268.00

B. Residential Services

The most economical way to operate the proposed residence would involve the purchase of a suitable building and the remodeling for its intended purpose. Upon completion of the program, this building could then be

resold or leased by the Government to interested public or private agencies. Should this not be possible, we are advised that the cost of $100 per bed is considered the base formula to compute rental cost.

Rent at $2,000 per month	$24,000.00
Telephone and Postage	720.00
Utilities and Heating	1,020.00
Supplies	600.00
Rental of Typewriter	600.00
Dry Cleaning	2,000.00
Washer-Dryer (institutional type)	2,500.00
Repairs, Furniture and Maintenance	10,000.00
	$41,440.00

C. Food

At $4.00 per day (100 x 365)	$36,500.00

D. Miscellaneous

Unanticipated Expenses	$20,000.00
Medical Services	10,000.00
Clothing (work)	5,000.00
Bed Linen	2,000.00
Blankets - purchase (200)	1,000.00
Travel (local for personnel at 10¢ per mile)	3,000.00
Local Travel for Residents at $1.00 per resident	9,125.00
Insurance	2,500.00
Rental - Furniture - Office	1,600.00
	$55,525.00
TOTAL	$199,733.00

Cost per day $\frac{(547 \times 365)}{(25)}$ per person: $21.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20001

JAMES A. BELSON
JUDGE

March 23, 1970

Mr. Leon Leiberg
Project Crossroads
527 6th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Leon:

This is to confirm the information I conveyed by telephone to Mr. Trotter that it was the consensus of the Board of Judges at its meeting of March 19, 1970, that Project Crossroads should be continued in existence as a part of this Court. As I indicated to you earlier, the Project will operate in close liaison with the Probation Department. Technically, however, it will not be a section of that Department. After inclusion, the director of the Project will report to the Chief Clerk, Mr. Burton, through the director of the Probation Department.

We will continue to give attention to the matter of acquiring the necessary appropriation for the Project.

With my best personal regards.

Sincerely,

Jim Belson
James A. Belson

cc: Chief Judge Greene
Mr. Burton
Mr. Bindl
Mr. Berling

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20001

JAMES A. BELSON
JUDGE

August 31, 1970

Mr. Leon G. Leiberg
Director
Project Crossroads
527 6th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dear Mr. Leiberg:

This letter is in response to your inquiry about the timetable and plans for the assimilation of Crossroads into the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. I have discussed the matter with Chief Judge Harold Greene, and he has asked me to make the following response for the Court.

As you know, the request for appropriations for the court reorganization plan has been submitted to Congress and includes the budget needs for the project. Presently the entire matter of funding for the period during which this Court will be transformed into the Superior Court is being submitted to Congress for consideration on a highly expedited basis. Under all the circumstances, it appears reasonable to assume that the monies will be forthcoming and available by the end of the calendar year.

In view of the fact that your present contract expires and funds from the Manpower Administration will not be available after September 15th, we would urge that an extension of the contract be sought until such time as regular funds for the Court's operation become available. This will permit the continuation of the project in its present form without interruption until the transition is completed and administrative problems worked out.

In the event that court funds become available prior to the end of the extension period of your contract, unexpended funds would be returned to the U.S. Department of Labor.

Should you experience any difficulties in obtaining this contract modification, we would be pleased to communicate directly with the Manpower Administration.

Very truly yours,

James A. Belson

James A. Belson

cc: Chief Judge Greene

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH *WASHINGTON DC, 20001*

PROJECT CROSSROADS *527 - SIXTH STREET NW*

(202) 628-7885
(202) 783-8853

LEON G. LEIBERG
Project Director

May 12, 1970

Mr. Walter S. Burke
Director, Neighborhood Youth
Corps
1000 U Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Burke:

Pursuant to discussions on April 28, 1970, with Mr. Obi Ogene, Deputy Director of NYC, I am requesting that Project Crossroads participate in the NYC-2 program beginning July 1, 1970. Access to said funding would provide a valuable adjunct to project services by providing another vehicle of upward mobility for project participants.

Project Crossroads has needed an inducement to private employers to hire and/or train youthful first offenders. These young men and women are handicapped by characteristics of many inner city residents, i.e., low levels of educational achievement, limited work records, lack of awareness of existing manpower resources, negative attitudinal factors, low aspirations, etc.

In addition, other factors adversely affect persons serviced by Crossroads, such as a reluctance by employers to accept young job applicants. The increased movement of Washington businesses to suburban localities has resulted in fewer entry level jobs for which young people must compete. Curtailment or phasing out of federally funded training resources has also aggravated the local manpower situation. Further, project participants are hampered vocationally by pending court charges which forbids employment by local governments.

Should Project Crossroads be selected as a sub-contractor to Neighborhood Youth Corps, it would perform the following functions:

- Develop on-the-job training facilities, both part-time and full-time.
- Select OJT occupations leading to upward mobility.
- Periodically inspect training sites and evaluate participant progress.
- Prepare reports to NYC as required.
- Select project participants meeting NYC criteria.
- Disburse stipends to project trainees.
- Tutor trainees for the GED during the training period.
- Provide ongoing supportive assistance.
- Assist in job placement where necessary.

The aforementioned would be performed by three components of project staff:

1. Crossroads' employment staff would be responsible for selection and supervision of on-the-job training facilities to be utilized by project participants. Employment staff will oversee vocational aptitude testing of project OJT candidates, largely relying on DVR and MTESA facilities. Occupations for which the participants will be trained will lead to permanent full-time meaningful employment. The employment staff will also assist persons in securing other employment in the future should placement with the trainer/employer prove unsatisfactory.

2. Project community workers will provide ongoing supportive services to participants while in training. Caseloads of less than 25 youths per counselor permit intensive contacts with participants and the community workers, a group of paraprofessionals and professional persons, will continue to deal with problems relating to schools, courts, homes, and the community.

3. A component of five VISTA volunteers assigned to the project, tutor participants for passing the high school equivalency examination (GED), selected government examinations, and provide educational remediation as needed.

The attached project description details external linkages with existing community services. We will be happy to answer any further inquiries you may have regarding the project. Looking forward to hearing from you, I remain,

Yours truly,

Daniel S. Little
Manpower Specialist

Enclosure:

cc: Mr. L. G. Leiberg
Mr. Obi Ogene

APPENDIX

Research Design

Proposed Data Gathering, Measurement
and
Assessment Techniques to be
Utilized in a Final Evaluation
of
Project Crossroads

Submitted by:
Roberta Rovner-Pieczenik
Consultant
Project Crossroads
November 1, 1969

Project Crossroads, by providing intensive manpower services to first time criminal offenders, offers an alternative to criminal adjudication through economic stabilization. The following report outlines data gathering methods and subsequent procedures for analysis.

At this time it will be difficult to abstract all the possible questions which will be asked of the data. However, the major areas of the final analysis will include the following:

1. The range of services received by Project Crossroads participants. This calls for a program description as well as summary statistics of employment placements, legal dispositions, etc.

2. An evaluation of the effectiveness of specific program operations in terms of short-run and long-range benefits to participants. Comparisons between participants and a control group of non-participants will be undertaken in the areas of employment and legal behavior. Included will be an evaluation of the type of individual most successful in a Crossroads-type program. Such variables as age of participant, sex, charge category, previous employment, and educational history will elicit a profile which will differentiate "high risk" from "low risk" categories of participants.

3. An understanding of program structure and operations and those specific program factors which explain its effectiveness. Included will be an evaluation of the time period necessary for working intensively with participants and the relative value of the different services afforded a participant. An evaluation of the impact of the staff itself will be made.

4. A cost analysis/effectiveness study determining the cost of program operations and evaluating the benefits to the courts, business community, etc. Comparisons will be made between participants and non-participant controls.

A description of the goals of Project Crossroads and services offered to participants can be found in previous interim reports. While these will not be repeated in this monograph, a word about goal-setting is appropriate. The goals of any organization determine the kinds of goods and services it produces and offers to the community. Project Crossroads is no exception to this principle. The project is and has been subject to evaluation by both the Department of Labor and the District of Columbia courts. Goals and program operations are necessarily a compromise between contractual obligations and original program conceptualization.

Utilizing the aforementioned topics as guides to the final analysis, the following report has been arbitrarily divided into divisions which permit clarity of presentation:

I- measures of program effectiveness for participants

II- the structure and operation of the program

III- relations between Project Crossroads and its "environment"-the court, employment market and social agencies.

An earlier communication proposed that all data be coded and transferred to IBM punch cards. Not only would this facilitate analysis but it would allow Project Crossroads results to be compared with findings from other demonstration projects. Also, questions could be put to the data at a later time which are not of immediate concern.

I Program Effectiveness for Participants (Research questions 1 & 2)

Behavioral and attitudinal indicants will be used to measure program effectiveness. Analysis will emphasize the behavioral indices because these are more easily measureable.

Legal Indicants

The following indicants will serve as operational definitions for the legal "success" of the program as it effects participants:

a. Type of adjudication of original charge (e.g. dismissal, held for trial, etc.)

b. Recidivism while enrolled in Project Crossroads (e.g. arrest and conviction record)

c. Recidivism after termination from Project Crossroads (e.g. arrest and conviction record)

d. Seriousness of subsequent offenses (e.g. felony vs. misdemeanor, personal vs. property offense, etc.)

Type of Adjudication

The court's disposition of the charge or complaint filed against the participant will influence the nature of his future contact with law enforcement agencies as well as his future employment possibilities. A dismissal of the charge for the first offender will be considered "desireable" from the participant's viewpoint and "successful" for that of the program. From the court perspective a dismissal reduces case backload and saves manpower hours and costs incurred in continuing prosecution.

A frequency tabulation of legal dispositions of project participants (including accompanying percentages for both juveniles and adults) will be presented. This information will be abstracted from the Participant Termination Form (Appendix A). Statistics for participants will be compared with: (1) annual court statistics and (2) a randomly selected control sample of juveniles and adults (Appendix B).

Recidivism

Recidivism as reported in the Uniform Crime Report--1967 varies by age of offender, crime type and other variables, but remains consistently high across all categories (e.g. of offenders under 20 released from custody in 1963, 70% recidivated within four years). Project Crossroads, by affecting the dismissal of charges avoids exposure of the participant to the corrupting influence of the jail or prison, while giving him the possibility of a legitimate economic stake in the community.

Recidivism rates for participants during program enrollment will be abstracted from the Participant Termination Form. Frequencies will be calculated separately for juveniles and adults, as will the following: dismissals and non-dismissals; favorable and unfavorable terminations; personal and property offenses; misdemeanor and felony charges; and other relevant differentiations. Statistics on recidivism rate following program termination will be abstracted from the Participant Follow-up Form (Appendix C). A longitudinal analysis of recidivism will be done at three month intervals for one year after program termination. According to national statistical trends, the largest percentage of recidivism occurs within a year following custody. The longer the period of non-recidivism, the less likely the individual to recidivate. While follow-up information on a randomly selected group of participants will be attempted.

Recidivism rates of project participants will be compared with rates of the control sample of non-participants. The follow-up form for controls is not yet completed. Follow-up for control will occur a year after case disposition. In order to control for invalid follow-up responses, it is suggested that a thorough check of court files be undertaken for recidivism statistics for a select number of participants.

Seriousness of Subsequent Offense

Recidivism can be measured both quantitatively and qualitatively. Thus, the nature and seriousness of a subsequent offense may be as important in understanding crime patterns as the absolute number.

Subsequent offenses will be classified and evaluated on a number of categories, including misdemeanor vs. felony charge, personal vs. property offense, seriousness of first charge vs. subsequent charges.

Statistics on the above indices will be tabulated and then cross-tabulated against such variables as: legal disposition of participant (dismissal vs. non-dismissal); termination recommendation by counselor (favorable vs. unfavorable); age categories (juvenile vs. adult offenders); educational background (high school graduate vs. non-graduate); and other relevant variables.

Employment data will be abstracted from the following records:

1. Intake Record (Appendix D): an interview schedule which records a participant's legal, employment, educational and family history.

2. Participant Termination Form: summarizes information recorded during project participation.

3. Participant Employment Record (Appendix E): records all employment services rendered to the participant.

4. Participant Follow-up Form: provides longitudinal employment information after project termination.

In addition to the major indicants of employment success the aforementioned forms also yield valuable information on work-related problems, turnover rates, and future vocational aspirations. Although ancillary, this information will allow interpretation of other employment findings.

Educational Indicants

The educational division of Project Crossroads displays a secondary role in project operations and participation is on a voluntary basis. Yet, in itself, taking part in the program might be an important indicant of serious intent for self-improvement by the participant.

For purposes of measuring educational "success" for those volunteering participants, the following indicants will be used: Separate tabulations will be kept for the participants and control sample, and for arrest and conviction rates.

Employment Indicants

Project Crossroads, as a manpower service, secures employment for the unemployed and underemployed. Quantitative measures of employment (e.g. position, salary) will be deemed important from both the community's and participant's viewpoint. Qualitative

factors of employment (e.g. attitude toward work, relationship with fellow employees and employer) will also shed light upon the work problems of the relatively unskilled, poorly educated worker. This will effect his long-run job potential.

The following indicants will serve as employment "success" of participants:

a. Referrals and placements through Project Crossroads, for employed and formerly unemployed participants.

b. Improved salary for the period including: (1) employment before entering Crossroads and last Crossroads job held; (2) employment entering Crossroads and leaving Crossroads; (3) employment at Crossroads termination and through last follow-up.

c. Job mobility for the period including: (1) employment before entering Crossroads and last Crossroads job held; (2) employment entering Crossroads and leaving Crossroads; (3) employment at Crossroads termination and through last follow-up.

d. Improvement of skills through job training programs and subsequent placement.

e. Favorable on-the-job work characteristics at project termination: regularity of work, promptness, etc.

f. Decreased welfare payments and unemployment compensation resulting from Crossroads job placements or employment thereafter.

1. Enrollment and attendance in the educational program.

2. High School equivalency diplomas received during project or because of project incentive.

3. Completion of remedial course of study (either during Crossroads enrollment or after termination).

4. Attendance in the educational division after formal project termination.

5. Re-entry into high school of dropouts, because of project efforts.

For purposes of statistics, we will tabulate numbers of enrollees in different programs of study and include the average number of hours of instruction per enrollee. Cross tabulation will be done relating such variables as age of participant, charge, legal "success" etc. with educational variables. Most information will be abstracted from the Educational Division Monthly Report (Appendix F) and the Participant Termination Form.

An evaluation of the effectiveness of Project Crossroads for specific types of participants will be attempted by cross tabulating legal and employment "success" and "failure" categories with specific personal (e.g. age, charge, sex) and program (e.g. easy to contact, enrolled in education) variables. Profiles of "high" and "low" risk participants will be derived.

II Structure and Operations of Project Crossroads (Research questions 3 & 4)

The measurement of a program's effectiveness is not a substitute for explaining success. An analysis of Project Crossroads operations should locate structural properties of the program which contribute to program success. Unfortunately, variation in program

structure is non-existent. For example, it would be difficult to say with certainty that a particular division of the program should be expanded or diminished. It may be that all project divisions are unnecessary as they now exist, because only a hint that the charge may be dropped offers enough incentive for changed behavior. It is suggested that future experimental and demonstration projects concern themselves with program variables as well as program outcomes so that a program's effectiveness can be precisely explained.

Yet, an attempt to explain Project Crossroads will be made here. Specific aspects of the program will be evaluated by both staff and participants.

A retrospective analysis of employment data should reflect the average time period needed to render adequate employment services to participants (in terms of job turnover and stabilization).

Staff Information

Interim reports have described the development of the project from initial "growing pains" through present maturity of operations. Ideally, an outside observer would take systematic note of staff operations. For example, he would note the results of personnel attrition and replacement; staff relationships which affect the working atmosphere, etc. Under existing conditions, the following information will be utilized.

Quantitative

Systematic, quantitative measurement of staff activities (instituted September 1969) will be abstracted for the counseling division from the Participant Action Form (Appendix G):

1. Contacts completed by the counselor with the participant and those made in behalf of the participant.

2. Place of contact (e.g. home, office)

3. Type of contact (e.g. telephone, personal)

4. Initiator of contact

5. Nature of problems discussed

6. Manner in which problems were handled by counselor or participant.

A summation of this information appears on the Supervisor's Weekly Report (Appendix H).

The activities of the employment staff will be abstracted from the Employment Monthly Report (Appendix I) and the Employment Activity Form (Appendix J). These forms will yield quantitative information concerning:

1. Placement activities (e.g. statistics of placements, time spent with participant)

2. Field activities (e.g. type of activity and time spent)

3. Job development activities (e.g. number of contacts per week, mode of contact, time spent on a contact)

The activities of the educational division are quantitatively summarized on the Educational Monthly Report. Basic statistics are available:

1. Statistics of participants and tutors (e.g. numbers, turnover)

2. Activities of tutors (e.g. subject areas taught, time spent per participant, per week)

Qualitative

Although quantitative measurements for some aspects of staff activities will be undertaken, they do not represent an accurate picture of a total job. A Crossroads job that involves close relationships between staff and participant, staff and staff and which offers changed individuals as an end product, relies on many tangible, difficult-to-measure variables. For example, no measurement can be taken on the enhanced feeling of self-worth a participant carries from the program.

Our only clue to some of these intangibles will be in the form of "soft" data. The final report of all staff members will cover their perceptions of the following:

1. Objectives (goals) of their job

2. Mode of operation necessary to achieve the objectives

3. Problems which must be dealt with on a continuing basis

4. Suggestions for change in division operations and their own job.

In addition to the above, supervisors will include in their reports a critique of operations from an administrative point of view (e.g. intra-division staff relations). A detailed guide for final reporting procedures will be completed at a later date.

Participant Information

The analysis of a project whose end product involves changes in individuals can not be comple without feedback from the individuals affected by the program. For this perspective on project operations a Participant Evaluation Form (Appendix K) will be routinely handed to every participant by his counselor. Questions are simple, asking for an evaluation of the program, as opposed to an evaluation of particular staff members.

Cost Analysis

An evaluation of program operations would not be complete without a cost analysis/effectiveness study. While cost studies of this type are standard procedure for business corporations they are just coming into vogue for the study of social problems which financially burden the taxpayer.

In addition to calculating the real operating costs of the project in relation to the number of participants served, a cost effectiveness study will compare a random sample of participants with the control sample of non-participants in terms of court and other costs, (e.g. unemployment compensation). A detailed analysis of average legal costs will be based on an updating of costs already computed by the Department of Correction in the District of Columbia, appearing in B. Cantor's and S. Adams', The Cost of Correcting Youthful Offenders (September 1968). Legal costs for arrest, court action, institutionalization and parole and probation supervision have been estimated. Follow-up information of a year's duration will be included.

Full details of the cost study have not yet been elaborated. At the present time, contracting for the services of an individual specializing in economics and cost analysis is being considered.

III The Environment and Project Crossroads

The "environment" in which an organization such as Project Crossroads exists influences its operation. Employment statistics (e.g. number of placements) are determined in part by the job market. Program variation (e.g. rendering full services to some participants and partial services to others) is bound by court stipulations. Outside social services necessary for participants (e.g. type of aid and immediacy of service) is related to the kinds of relationships which exist between staff members of Project Crossroads and the outside agency. In order words, the "environment" or "field" is an intervening and sometimes determining variable, itself, in influencing program operations.

Job Market

The job market available to participant is a function of both existing job and training opportunities in the area and the effectiveness of the job developers in uncovering potential positions.

Information on job development (e.g. description, problems, types of relationships established, suggestions for future job developing, etc.) will be contained in final job developer reports. The Employment Activities Record will reveal certain objective information regarding the type of companies contacted, mode of contact, time spent "developing" a contact, etc. Together, the records and final report will offer a picture of the job developer's operation.

Yet, the gap between job developing and job placement is an important one. Do all companies who promise jobs, "come through"? Which types of employers and companies are most amenable to working with our project-government, large private, small private, etc.? What is the rate of turnover for different kinds of positions? What kinds of positions are available to our participants? When is on-the-job training offered? Does training enhance salary prospects? These and many other questions will be answered by portraying a picture of the realities of the job market as they affect the program. Most of this information will be abstracted from the Job Placement and Training Placement Forms (Appendix L).

Courts

Relations with the courts (juvenile and general sessions) will be described in terms of chronology by staff supervisors and the project director. The ways in which direct court restraints (e.g. charge categories deemed acceptable) and operations (e.g. court recommendations for eligible participants) influence Project Crossroads will be analyzed. Suggestions for improved working relations will be offered.

Social Agencies

Contact between Project Crossroads and outside social service agencies (e.g. hospitals, welfare bureau, etc.) will be monitored. Abstracted from the Participant Contact sheet and the Employment Activities sheet will be contacts made between Crossroads and other agencies on behalf of the participants. This will be coupled with the final report of the staff, emphasizing the types of working relationships maintained (if any) with outside agencies and the importance of these agencies to Crossroads operations. Suggestions for inter-agency information transfer and utilization will be offered.

Concluding Note

The measurement and assessment of an experimentation and demonstration project is a difficult task. Variables of concern are numerous, involving personal, organizational and environmental factors (not to mention time, place, etc.) Controls are necessary, although imperfect. Evaluations are critical, although imprecise at times. To put a program into operation constitutes the "means" of the system, according to a researcher. An adequate understanding of the program's operation and effectiveness is the real "goal."

Continuation of House proceedings of December 21, 1970, appear in this issue after today's House proceedings

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 116 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 22, 1970 *No. 207*

Senate

PROJECT CROSSROADS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, our prisons are overcrowded, underfunded, and understaffed. Too many correctional institutions harden the casual offender into a committed criminal. It often radicalizes inmates, breeds anger, retribution, and recidivision. Our correctional system is too often not a positive contribution. Both the criminal and society suffer.

There are a growing number of criminologists who believe that the only way to break this vicious cycle is to avoid the correctional institution, at least until it has established modern and relevant rehabilitative techniques. Halfway houses, residential centers, and so forth, have begun in an effort toward accomplishing this objective. Society demands such effort in the search for law and order for every man's safety and security, as well as for the pursuit of justice.

Project Crossroads, a Labor Department funded manpower project attempts to keep prospective defendants out of jail by putting them into jobs. It is a creative and innovative program which gives manpower services to young first offenders. It is not a free ride. Prospective defendants upon arrest are interviewed by the Crossroads staff to decide whether they meet the qualifications for participation in the program. If they do, and with the consent of their counsel, the judge, and the district attorney, the individuals are placed into jobs and given remedial and manpower services. If after a couple of months they do not show signs of adjustment, they are placed back on the court calendar for trial. Nothing is lost.

If the program is successful, the individual may avoid the judicial system with its expenditure of precious time and meager money, and circumvent the doubtful success of the correctional institution. But above all, there is a possibility that a human life is saved—that a human life may become productive both to himself and to the community. It is an experiment worthy of close study and careful evaluation.

The following two articles, one as it appeared in the November 4 issue of Manpower Information Service publication and the other by the Crossroads help to explain the program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the above-mentioned articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Project Crossroads, October 1970]

AN EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FUNDED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

I. INTRODUCTION

Crime has become one of the most virulent diseases of our society—a disease for which no certain cure has been found. The President of the United States, in his State of the Union Message, called for ". . . war against the criminal elements which increasingly threaten our cities, our homes and our lives." The President asked for "new and stronger weapons" to wage this war.

Perhaps, through Project Crossroads and similar programs we may identify a few "weapons" which we believe can be effective in the continuing search for answers to this growing problem.

Given an opportunity for a job that pays a decent salary, with a chance for advancement, and provided adequate training to qualify for the job, will a young person choose crime? We don't believe he will. This isn't a simple solution of course, for each youth presents a different problem and a new challenge. It is only by recognizing the needs of each individual that we can reach young people in their first conflict with the law.

If these young people can be turned aside from lawbreaking before they have established a "record," there is a greater hope that they will refrain from committing further acts of delinquency and crime. One of the most crippling handicaps a young person can have in seeking a career is a record of conflict with the law. If redirection and new motivation can be achieved before the habit of lawbreaking has been established, prevention, the most powerful weapon against crime, is in our hands.

MRS. ISABELLA J. JONES,
Executive Director, National Committee for Children and Youth.

II. WHY PRETRIAL DIVERSION

The concept of pretrial diversion embraced by Project Crossroads has three points of focus: the criminal defendant himself, the criminal justice system which must respond to his social deviance, and the community to which both belong. In the first instance, the project aspires to provide accused offenders with an assist along the road to social and economic viability through the application of intensive, short-term manpower services.

In the second area, the project hopes to demonstrate a feasible method of making the criminal justice system flexible in its operation and more effective as a rehabilitation vehicle. The former is achieved by building into the system an alternative to the three traditional dispositional possibilities: discharge without supportive services, release on probation (formal or informal) with a modicum of support, and incarceration, usually the least desirable of all. At the same time, the system's effectiveness as a rehabilitative and deterrent mechanism is enhanced by the availability of relevant, personalized and intensive services for young offenders who may be on the threshold of a criminal career, and for whom normal court processing would in all probability be a negative and hardening experience.

Thirdly, as a result of this intervention, the community as a whole gains from the reduction in recidivism or repeated criminal activity among the group served as well as from their improved employability and productivity.

Project Crossroads was designed for implementation in two phases. Phase I (January 15, 1968-May 15, 1969) was devoted to exploration and development in the areas of program concepts, staffing, administration, human services, and the utilization of community and VISTA volunteers. It had an enrollment goal of 350 first offenders. During Phase II, which covers the period of May 16, 1969, the December 15, 1970, program effectiveness is being measured and assessed, with particular reference to the feasibility of its replication in other jurisdictions. At the end of Phase II, during which 500 additional enrollees will have been served, the project will become a component of the new Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

III. HOW THE PROJECT OPERATES

A. Organization and staffing

The project staff of 14 paid workers and seven VISTA volunteers is divided into three components: counseling, employment services, and education. The counseling section of five community worker-counselors and one supervisor is responsible for both the screening of prospective enrollees and the provision of close guidance and supportive services for assigned caseloads which average about 20-25 youths per counselor.

The employment section of three placement officers and a manpower specialist has

the task of evaluating the employment and training needs of enrollees and placing them in good positions offering skill upgrading, good pay and upward mobility.

The education section of the project is staffed by seven VISTA volunteers assigned by EOE to provide community involvement in the Crossroads program. The VISTAs recruit and coordinate a volunteer staff of about 45 tutors to provide individualized tutoring and test preparation services to project participants and other youths referred by community agencies.

Backing up the three operational components are a project director, an assistant director, and two secretaries.

One of the project's experimental and demonstration features has been the utilization of non-professional staff in what have been traditionally professional occupational roles. Consequently the project is staffed primarily by non-professional workers most of whom are culturally and experientially similar to the participant population. These workers have demonstrated their ability and dedication to the goals of the project and have earned the respect and praise of their professional counterparts in other community agencies with which they work.

B. Recruiting participants

Project Crossroads recruits participants from both the Juvenile and General Sessions (adult) Courts of the District of Columbia. In the adult jurisdiction, project recruitment procedures closely parallel normal court processing of defendants. Project community workers screen all defendants detained in the court cellblock prior to each day's arraignment, and interview those who meet enrollment criteria. If an eligible defendant desires to participate in the program, the consent of the United States Attorney's Office and of assigned defense counsel is then obtained and an identifying card attached to the defendant's papers in arraignment court. When the defendant's case is called, usually within 2–3 hours of his initial interview, his case is continued for 90 days to permit project participation and the youth goes directly from the courtroom to the project office only one block away.

Recruitment procedures are different for the project's Juvenile Court program. There court Intake Officers, who interview each youth referred to the court on a delinquency complaint and decide whether or not he is to be petitioned for a court hearing, refer cases meeting Crossroads criteria to a project community worker stationed in the court. If the youth desires to enroll after the program has been explained to him, the intake officer is notified and the youth invited to the project office, preferably with a parent or guardian, to be formally enrolled and assigned a counselor-community worker. The cases of juvenile participants are also calendared to permit a 90-day project enrollment period.

Following are the project's enrollment criteria as of September, 1970:

1. Sex, age: Males and females between 16 and 26.

2. Residence: Washington, D.C., Metropolitan Area.

3. Employment status: Unemployed, underemployed, or job in jeopardy because of arrest; for juveniles, tenuous school enrollment or school dropout.

4. Present charge: Petit larcency, auto theft (attempted), receiving stolen property, false pretenses, forgery, soliciting for prostitution, attempted burglary II, simple assault (relative), unlawful entry, presence in illegal establishment, destroying property, procuring. Irrespective of charge, drug addicts, alcoholics, and defendants with serious psychological disorders are excluded.

5. Pretrial release status: Must qualify for personal recognizance under the criteria of the District of Columbia Bail Agency.

6. Prior record: For adults, no previous adult conviction nor incarceration for more than one year as a juvenile; for juvenile participants, no adjudication of involvement within preceding 12 months, no pending case less than six months old, no previous incarceration for six months or more.

C. Counseling and personal assistance

Each new Project Crossroads participant is assigned a community worker-counselor who is responsible for providing supportive services for the duration of his project program and for submitting biweekly evaluation reports on his project performance to the appropriate court.

The initial contact between counselor and participant is usually the "intake interview" conducted on the latter's first visit to the project office after recruitment. During this interview the program is explained in detail and the counselor ascertains the youth's immediate needs—usually employment and, in many cases, emergency financial assistance—and any personal or family problems that may require referral to local social welfare agencies.

During the first couple of weeks when a participant's project program is being developed, his counselor maintains frequent or even daily contact with the youth. When the participant is settled into a job and/or school situation, the counselor is expected to maintain personal contact with him at least once weekly and telephone contact as frequently as possible. Home visits are the primary focus of personal contacts, since any rehabilitative efforts must take into account the factors of a youth's home environment which may be somewhat responsible for his social problems. Visits to a participant's job as well as school and neighborhood visits are also emphasized.

Although group counseling is not an integral part of the project's supportive services, counselors are encouraged to hold group sessions with members of their caseloads whom they feel will benefit from group discussion of mutual problems.

An important facet of Project Crossroads is its role as a middleman between participants and local social welfare service organizations. While many participants and their families have needs far beyond the budgetary and staff capabilities of the project, they often lack knowledge of the availability of appropriate resources or of the necessary procedures to obtain access to them. These needs range from medical and dental care to legal assistance, to emergency food, shelter and clothing. Liaison has been established with public and private organizations able to address these various needs and arrangements made for expedited access to services for participants and their families.

D. Employment and training placement

After his initial interview, each participant is accompanied by his counselor to the project's employment section where a job placement officer discusses the various employment and vocational training opportunities available to him through the project. The employment staff arranges employment interviews for the youth in any occupational area he expresses interest in, and will continue to do so until a suitable placement is made. If the participant desires and is qualified for a job not then available, the staff attempts to develop an appropriate opening.

Application forms for government jobs and most of the local manpower training programs are kept in the employment section and all necessary arrangements for testing or interviewing for such positions can be made directly from the project office. There is a close working relationship with the Manpower Training and Employment Security Administration (MTESA) of the District of Columbia, with sharing of information and mutual support.

The employment staff and counselors periodically review the status of each participant to determine if a change in employment is necessary or advisable, either because of job dissatisfaction, lack of upward mobility, or the availability of new jobs for which the participant is better suited.

E. Education services

Each new participant is given an orientation on the project's remedial education program by one of the VISTA volunteers responsible for that component. Individual tutoring is available four evenigns per week in the project office and specialized programs such as preparation for the high school equivalent diploma examination, remedial reading, job test preparation and the preparation for armed forces qualifying examinations are offered. The participant is encouraged to avail himself of the education program to any extent he desires and which is compatible with his job or school schedule. The education staff also provides assistance to youths who wish to re-enroll in school and those who are seeking admission to colleges. A scholarship fund donated by friends of the project has been established at two local colleges for qualified project participants.

Ancillary activities conducted by the education component include field trips, films, seminars with guest speakers, and intra-project sports competitions.

F. Court review

Biweekly progress reports on each enrollee are forwarded to the appropriate court for inclusion in the youth's case file, with copies to defense counsel and/or parents.

At the end of the prescribed 90-day period, a participant's counselor may make one of three recommendations to the court at a disposition conference: (1) dismissal of pending charges based on satisfactory project participation and demonstrated self-improvement; (2) extension of the continuance to allow the project staff more time to work with the individual, or (3) reversion of the defendant to normal court processing, without prejudice, because of unsatisfactory performance in the program. In addition, at any time during the 90-day period a participant may be unfavorably terminated and revert to normal court processing and trial either because of chronic uncooperativeness or the commission of a new offense.

IV. SUMMARY RESULTS

From the start of court recruitment in April, 1968, through September, 1970, a total of 825 young offenders had been enrolled in the project, 72 of whom were still active. Charges against 468 enrollees had been dropped due to their successful project participation, while 285 were returned to normal court processing, primarily because of unsatisfactory program performance. The respective dismissal rates for program participants were 76% for General Sessions Court (adult) enrollees and 40% for Juvenile Court enrollees.

In keeping with the manpower orientation of the project, approximately 1000 job and training placements have been made for participants, including non-enrollees, and over 6000 hours of remedial education and test coaching was provided by volunteer tutors

under the direction of the project's VISTA component.

Research evaluations of the project indicated that the intensive supportive services provided by project staff during the three-month enrollment period had a substantial stabilizing effect on participants in the post-project period. For example, the employment rate among former enrollees a year after leaving the project was more than double that at the time of enrollment, and recidivism among former participants was one-third less than that of a control group which did not receive project services. Equally important from the point of view of program replication, the project exhibited a benefit-cost ratio of at least 2:1, and a program cost of little over $500 per enrollee.

BACKGROUND OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

The National Committee for Children and Youth grew out of historical concern by leaders in education, social service, religion and health for the total well-being of America's children and youth. Its roots trace back to the first White House Conference called by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1909 and similar conferences convened of presidents in each succeeding decade. A provision for organized followup activity, built into the plans and financing for the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth, called by President Eisenhower, resulted in the creation of the NCCY on November 1, 1966.

But NCCY is more than a followup agency. In doing that job it quickly evolved into an essential national point of focus on children and youth in the rapidly changing decade of the sixties, helping its national, state and local constituency keep aware of developments, stimulating governmental and voluntary cooperation, and undertaking demonstration projects to pioneer new services.

While keeping its focus on the positive, i.e., helping all of America's children grow into knowledgeable, healthy and responsible citizens, NCCY helps the agencies deal with such problems as delinquency, dropouts, lack of opportunity, urban and rural slums, weakening family ties, etc. Beyond that, however, and in response to the very multiplicity of agencies and programs, governmental and voluntary, NCCY serves an essential coordinating function, helping avoid wasteful duplication, promoting exchange of experiences and stimulating cooperative activity. NCCY is thus in itself a pioneering experiment in organization for effective concern for all children and youth.

[From the Manpower Information Service, Nov. 4, 1970]

HIGHLIGHTS OF CURRENT REPORT

"Substantial Unemployment," Job Vacancies Rise: The list of areas with 6 percent or more unemployment rose again as of November 1 with the addition of Los Angeles and four other major areas to lift the total to 170 in all. Manufacturing job vacancies dropped to 137,000 in August, mostly in durable goods.

Industry Help South for Blue Collar Workers: Again pointing to the plight of the blue collar worker, Assistant Labor Secretary Jerome M. Rosow tells businessmen it is in their "self interest" to help out. He cites "job enrichment" and sensitivity training for foremen among series of recommendations.

New Career Interns Upgraded in Federal Plan: An in-house upgrading program in the Office of Education is designed to move clerical employees out of dead-end jobs into professional positions. Three-year program, seen as "model" for other federal agencies, mixes classroom study with new work assignments.

Pollution/Poverty Attacked in Training Effort: A $1.2 million contract to train 1,000 disadvantaged persons as waste treatment plant operators is signed between the Federal Water Quality Administration and the Labor Department. Funds will be allocated among 27 states for both training and upgrading.

Kentucky Tests Home Repair Project for Needy: A pilot home repair demonstration project for the aged and disabled in four rural communities successfully uses unemployed in rebuilding effort. Federal-state-local agencies recommend project expansion but find $500 per-house federal maximum is insufficient.

JOBS Contracts Advance but Impact Doubtful: Despite declining economic activity, the National Alliance of Businessmen's JOBS training contracts are on the rise. Appeal of training funds seen as one factor in upsurge, but net employment gain is questioned. MIS examines new trends in $200 million program.

Administration Releases Funds for Education: Some $498 million in education funds withheld by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were released after a legal decision that they were a mandatory appropriation of Congress. Education programs for needy get $160 million, Voc Ed gains $64 million.

"Project Crossroads" Guides Offenders to Jobs: A three-year pilot rehabilitation project in Washington, D.C., provides manpower services to young first offenders before trial. Counseling, job placement, and remedial services are offered in project aiding more than 1,300 youths arrested for misdemeanors.

Bus Project Links Ghettos to Suburban Jobs: A one-year pilot project by the St. Louis Model Cities Agency tests the feasibility of subsidized transportation of ghetto residents to suburban jobs. Study sees pitfalls in city-to-suburb transportation; favors "flexible" routes, smaller buses for task.

Studies Rate Fairness of Minority Job Testing: Procedures for testing minority job applicants are reviewed in study of research reports, *Employment Testing and Minority Groups*. The reports examine the relationship between ability test predictions and performance by blacks; review test validation procedures.

PRETRIAL "PROJECT CROSSROADS" OFFERS DELINQUENTS JOBS, NOT JAIL

On the theory that a solution to urban crime requires more than post-imprisonmen rehabilitation programs, an experimenta effort known as Project Crossroads in Wash ington, D.C., has devoted nearly three year to a different approach to rehabilitation—stepping in with manpower services befor young first-offenders are tried and sentenced Eight hundred young people have been en rolled in the project's counseling, job place ment, and remedial education services im mediately after their arrest on misdemeano charges, and 500 other younthful offender have participated as well. With the coopera tion of the D.C. Juvenile or General Session Courts, those who show satisfactory prog ess toward leading socially productive live may have their charges dropped. Weighin the project's costs against the youths' earn ings and their lowered recidivism rate. Cross roads staff feel the approach is a success an "an efficient use of society's resources."

Funded by a federal manpower demonstra tion grant and operated since early 1968 b the National Committee for Children an Youth, Project Crossroads has had suc promising results in Washington that th Labor Department hopes to sponsor variations of its approach in other cities. Cleveland and Minneapolis are soon to become sites of two more pre-trial intervention projects, while others may be launched next year in Boston, Baltimore, San Antonio, San Jose, and perhaps other cities.

NONPROFESSIONAL STAFF

Crossroads is similar in many ways to the Manhattan Court Employment Project run by the Vera Institute of Justice in New York (see MIS, April 22, 1970, page 24). Also a pre-trial program of manpower services, the Vera program employs ex-convicts as counselors on the theory that they will be more sympathetic to the problems of defendants, having had the same problems themselves. But Crossroads Director Leon Leiberg asserts that Crossroads is unlike the New York project in that its entire staff—counselors, job developers, and back-up administrators alike—are to be nonprofessionals; persons whose backgrounds are like those of their clients. Though the indigenous inner-city staffers are aided by VISTA volunteers, Leiberg and an assistant are the only professionals on Crossroads staff. When the Washington project completes its experimental phase and gets on its feet as a permanent institution working with the courts, these two men will bow out of the picture—probably within the next few months.

Use of a nonprofessional staff has proved to be a great improvement over what Leiberg terms the traditional "do-good" sort of counseling. But he points out that numerous problems arose during its evolution. The former inmates, high school dropouts, and chronically unemployed persons who were hired had to be trained to work within the system, he noted. Their training had to bridge a communications gap, refining their understanding of various manpower terms and techniques such as job development and counseling. Many felt initially that their being black and empathetic would be enough to help them reach their clients, and they tended to disregard professional approaches.

For this reason, an in-service training program was made mandatory for the staff. Crossroads hired one professional training person who organized seminars, casework conferences, and participation in a special course on group leadership at Washington's Federal City College. Particularly noteworthy was the college's response to the project. Not only did it create the course to fit the needs of Crossroads staff, but it opened all of its regular classes to the staff members regardless of their previous academic standing.

Leiberg feels that in-service training of nonprofessionals has been a key to the success of the project. He is confident that when he turns over Crossroads' direction to the top nonprofessional under his command, the program will be in good hands.

Alternative to trial

The concept of giving youthful offenders an opportunity to do something constructive rather than sending them to court has caught the imagination not only of Crossroads staff but of D.C. court officials as well. According to Leiberg, the U.S. attorney in Washington welcomed the plan because it offered a meaningful alternative between the extremes of dismissing the case at once and sending it to trial. Since 60 percent of Washington's crime at the time the project was launched was attributed to juveniles (youths under 18), Crossroads could aid not only the youths but the overloaded court machinery. The police, too, have been enthusiastic about the plan, Leiberg says.

This is not to say that it was easy to win support for Project Crossroads, however. Be-

fore the project could get off the ground, some skeptics had to be convinced of the idea's soundness, Leiberg says. Arguments were raised, suggesting that the legal rights of a defendant would be violated, that he might be presumed guilty without a trial, if he entered into this sort of rehabilitation program. Crossroads countered that no person would participate unless he and his legal counsel approved.

In the nearly three years since Crossroads began serving 16 to 22 year olds, more than 1,300 young men and women have participated. Of these, 800 had been accused of such offenses as burglary, auto theft, larceny, forgery, or prostitution; the names of eligible defendants are taken each morning from police lock-up files. Another 557 were enrolled unofficially, having heard of the program through friends or publicity posters.

Job seen as key

Crossroads emphasizes getting a job. "We feel it is important to find work quickly, but there are no broom and dishwashing jobs," Leiberg comments. Within 48 hours of his first interview with a Crossroads counselor, an enrollee is placed in some sort of employment—not the most desirable work, perhaps, but enough to sustain him and help him pay his bills. When the counselor has had a chance to assess his needs and search out a better opportunity, he may move on; participants usually hold three or four jobs while they are enrolled in Crossroads.

Job counselors keep in touch with areas employers and the Washington Job Bank. Typical jobs may be with banks, government, or airlines. Sometimes enrollees are referred to training programs, and for those lacking education, VISTA volunteers conduct evening tutoring sessions at Crossroads headquarters.

The project offers both group and individual counseling, focusing on employment goals and personal problems of enrollees. Each participants has a counselor who is responsible for him for the full 90 days. It is the counselor who keeps in touch with the court every two weeks on an enrollee's progress and who appears before the D.A. shortly before the trial is set to arrange dismissal of the case.

Generally, four to six months elapse in Washington between the time a defendant is originally apprehended and the date of his trial, Leiberg noted. Crossroads staff is usually able to tell within 30 or 40 days if a participant is not responding to counseling and job placement services, in which event his case reverts to a court trial. Two thirds of the enrollees do complete the program, though. If they have shown progress, Crossroads report this to the court and requests that the case be dismissed. The court has been very cooperative.

Wider use anticipated

Crossroads' effect on young first-offenders indicates that this approach holds promise in treating the problems of juvenile delinquency and crime. Of 400 participants whose cases have been followed up by a Crossroads survey, 80 percent are still employed. Only 10 percent are repeat offenders. Enrollees who fail to complete the program tend to have both higher recidivism rates and more unemployment.

At a cost of $506 per enrollee, the expenses involved in a pre-trial intervention program make it "very, very competitive" with court, jury, and trial costs, Leiberg asserts. So far, its budget has come entirely from the Labor Department demonstration grant. Since the grant expires this fall, Leiberg—with the backing of the court—has sought money from the D.C. budget to make Crossroads a permanent, independent organization working under the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. Leiberg estimates that Project Crossroads would ned about $21,000 a month initially, later perhaps doubling in size. However, Congress must approve all D.C. appropriations and has not yet acted on the court appropriations for 1971.

Leiberg, who has been consulting with the Labor Department on initiating similar programs in other cities, feels Project Crossroads has demonstrated several important points for planners of pre-trial intervention. The criminal justice system in many cities needs reform, he declares. In Washington, the courts have recently been reorganized in an effort to make them more efficient. A pretrial program like Crossroads, he feels, can help further relieve the court system of its growing load as well as intervening before a potentially good citizen has spent time in the harmful atmosphere of a prison.

The use of nonprofessionals, too, has been shown to be a vital aspect of successfully aiding young offenders. Their rapport, their common experiences are helpful in gaining enrollees' respect, as well as the support of the inner-city neighborhood. At the same time, Leiberg observes, recruitment of nonprofessionals adds urgency to the need for planning permanent sources of funds. It would not be fair, he asserts, to train nonprofessionals like guinea pigs and leave them stranded when federal demonstration funds expire.

Further experiments along the lines of Project Crossroads will explore other administrative features which might enhance a pretrial manpower program. Some will test the approach in neighborhoods which are predominantly Spanish-speaking, poor white, or Indian. One may even test the idea of making the pretrial program a private money-making venture, Leiberg hinted.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 116 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1970 No. 91

PROJECT CROSSROADS—IS AT ITS CROSSROADS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 4, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, we have become too uncreative in our solutions toward crime. More jails, more police, more guns will not halt crime—it will only put it in abeyance. To solve crime we must attack its causes as well as its effects. We must rehabilitate our cities as well as the offenders.

Project Crossroads of the District of Columbia is a program sponsored by the Labor Department in an effort to keep young first offenders out of jail and into jobs. Project Crossroads helps the city as it assists the offender. By putting offenders (not defendants—the project gets its participants before the court adjudges them) into useful jobs the city benefits by getting additional productive taxpayers while the individual betters himself by gaining pride and involvement in society.

Project Crossroads saves money and lives. So many congressional hearings, crime reports, and criminologists have told us of the high costs and meager success of our penal system. Mr. Leon Leiberg, executive director of the program has demonstrated that Project Crossroads is economically sound, personally benefiting and unequivocally successful. He should be commended for his efforts and leadership.

Now it is our turn. Project Crossroads is at its crossroads. It will either terminate its 2-year experiment program with only the District of Columbia utilizing its work and efforts or it will go across the country into all the troubled cities as a full-fledged program. I prefer the latter. And, I urge my colleagues to support this program as a permanent part of our rehabilitation system.

I was happy to hear WRC in its editorial endorse the program. I insert that editorial into the RECORD:

PROJECT CROSSROADS

Have you ever heard of Project Crossroads? Probably not. It is a two-year experiment with more than a thousand young first offenders from the inner city who became involved with the law in both Juvenile and General Sessions Court.

When a youth is arrested for an offense, but prior to his processing through the legal channels, a Project Crossroads counselor moves into the case. If accepted for the program, the counselor works with the first offender to provide intensive, pre-trial rehabilitation services—a job, training and added education.

After three months the Project Crossroads counselor reports to the court on the progress made with the youth and recommends the action to be taken.

The results have produced a number of plus values. The first offender who goes through the program is unlikely to be a repeater. General Sessions Court Judges were so impressed with the result that charges against 74 percent of the 346 young people who finished the program were dropped before trial. In only three of the cases did the court refuse to follow the recommendation of Project Crossroads. Thus, it is an alternative to delinquency adjudication and criminal prosecution and can appreciably reduce the case backlog.

Project Crossroads, funded by the Labor Department, will come to an end in September. It has been so successful the Court of General Sessions intends to ask that it be made an independent arm of the court system.

WRC–TV supports this proposal and urges that the Project Crossroads concept be greatly expanded.

WRC NBC TV4 Editorial

Volume One, Number Thirty-nine
Project Crossroads
Broadcast: April 29 and 30, 1970

Have you ever heard of Project Crossroads? Probably not. It is a two-year experiment with more than a thousand young first offenders from the inner city who became involved with the law in both Juvenile and General Sessions Court.

When a youth is arrested for an offense, but prior to his processing through the legal channels, a Project Crossroads counselor moves into the case. If accepted for the program, the counselor works with the first offender to provide intensive, pre-trial rehabilitation services -- a job, training and added education.

After three months the Project Crossroads counselor reports to the court on the progress made with the youth and recommends the action to be taken.

The results have produced a number of plus values. The first offender who goes through the program is unlikely to be a repeater. General Sessions Court Judges were so impressed with the result that charges against 74 percent of the 346 young people who finished the program were dropped before trial. In only three of the cases did the court refuse to follow the recommendation of Project Crossroads. Thus, it is an alternative to delinquency adjudication and criminal prosecution and can appreciably reduce the case backlog.

Project Crossroads, funded by the Labor Department, will come to an end in September. It has been so successful the Court of General Sessions intends to ask that it be made an independent arm of the court system.

WRC-Tv supports this proposal and urges that the Project Crossroads concept be greatly expanded.

This editorial expresses the opinion of WRC-TV. Persons with opposing views are welcome to request time to reply. Address all replies to: Bryson Rash, Manager, Editorial Services, WRC-TV, 4001 Nebraska Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20016.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20001

HAROLD H. GREENE
CHIEF JUDGE

January 28, 1971

Mrs. Isabella J. Jones
Executive Director
The National Committee for
Children and Youth
1145 19th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dear Mrs. Jones:

This letter is to officially confirm the fact that Project Crossroads will become part of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia on February 1, 1971. This change will be for all purposes including funding, equipment, and personnel.

I believe that the addition of Project Crossroads to the Court is a significant step forward in providing the fullest and most effective counseling and rehabilitative services within our Probation Department, and I appreciate the leadership provided by the National Committee in establishing this Project.

Sincerely,

Harold H. Greene
Chief Judge

CC: Judge James A. Belson

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Edward D. Greenwood, Chairman
Mrs. Thomas Herlihy, Jr., Vice Chairman
Mrs. Suzanne P. Jordan, Secretary
Mr. Charles B. Levinson, Treasurer
Mr. Philip E. Ryan, Assistant Treasurer
Dr. Lyle W. Ashby
Mrs. Rollin Brown
Mrs. A. D. Buchmueller
Dr. E. H. Christopherson
Mr. Richard J. Clendenen
Mr. Eli E. Cohen
Dr. Joseph H. Douglass
Mr. G. K. Hodenfield
Mrs. Clifford H. Jorgensen
Mrs. W. W. Lynch, Sr.
Colonel Belle Leach
Miss Alberta L. Meyer
Mr. Curtis Ray
Mr. David B. Ray, Jr.
Dr. Georgia B. Perkins Reaser
Mrs. Winthrop Rockefeller
Dr. Roland B. Scott
Dr. John Slawson
Mr. James R. Smith
Mr. Ray C. Votaw
Dr. Ruth Stout Wright
Mrs. Sara-Alyce Wright

******

Mrs. Isabella J. Jones, Executive Director
Mr. Sian S. Bong, Administrative Officer

******